









THE  
FREE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. I.

FROM SEPTEMBER TO DECEMBER, 1843.

'Thou shalt arise, and have mercy upon Zion.'—PSALM cii. 13.

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY W. RUSHTON,

AND

SOLD BY MESSRS. THACKER AND CO., MESSRS. OSTELL AND LEPAGE,  
AND MESSRS. HAY, MEIK AND CO.

1843.



# INDEX

## TO THE

# FREE CHURCHMAN.

### VOL. I.

	<i>Page.</i>
Act, Protest against the	326
—, Restoring Church Patronage, Passing of the	323
Address, Introductory to the Adherents of the Free Protestant Church of Scotland in Calcutta	1
—, Pastoral by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland	2
—, General Assembly's, to Ministers Abroad	107
Assembly, the General, Sitting of, 30th May 1843	501
—, 17th October, 1843	513
Candlish, Dr., Extract from a Speech of, in Glasgow, 12th June, 1843	63
—, Rev. Dr., Extract from a Sermon of the	181
Chalmer's, Dr., his Prospects	335
—, Dr., Speech at the Bicentenary of the "Westminster Assembly," July 1843	184
—, Dr., Speech in the Commission of the General Assembly	176
Christian Experience	327
—, Union, on the Great Meeting for, June, 1843	24
Churches Foreign, Correspondence with	98
—, ditto of	403
Circular, the first London	329
—, the second ditto	330
Coincidence A—, or, the Edinburgh Festival	423
Cunningham, Dr., Extract from his Speech in London, 28th June, 1843	21
Duff, the Rev. Dr., Lectures on the Disruption of the Established Church of Scotland	71, 110, 193, 260, 337, 429
Educational Measures of the Free Church	108
Edinburgh under Moderatism in 1783	305
Editorial Note	428
Estimate of the Secession	495
Exodus of the Church of Scotland	474
General Assembly, Meeting of	362
Glance a, at the Past	34
Gordon, the Rev. Dr., Address to the General Assembly, 19th May, 1843	13
Free Church at Home	249, 299
—, Cause in England	377
—, Progress	362
—, In Scotland	362
—, Question, Letter of an Episcopalian Friend on	345
Financial Pressure	334
Friends, Our Madras	504
Home Intelligence	38, 107, 163

	<i>Page.</i>
Incident, an Ecclesiastical . . . . .	426
Indian Intelligence (Madras and Bombay) . . . . .	31
Journal, Proposed Presbyterian in London . . . . .	333
Indian Intelligence (Calcutta) . . . . . 26, 68, 190, 254,	528
Jews, Conversion of the . . . . .	95
Jurist, the India, and the Free Church . . . . .	318
Letter, Extract from a private, dated Edinburgh, 28th July, 1843 . . . . .	58
Mail, the August . . . . .	162,
September . . . . .	362
Manse the, Flittin' . . . . .	104
McCheyne, the late Rev. R. of Dundee, Obituary Notice of . . . . .	44
Miscellaneous . . . . . 25, 65, 114, 188, 329,	390
Missionaries, Scottish in India, Correspondence of with the Church at Home . . . . .	159
—, Calcutta, Letter from one of the . . . . .	161
Missions Foreign, Extracts from the General Assembly's Proceedings relative to its . . . . .	16
Nabal and David . . . . .	156
Ninety-third Highlanders, the . . . . .	422
Patronage, Fragments concerning . . . . .	323
— Act of Queen Anne, a few Words on the . . . . .	245
Paysoniana . . . . .	64
Residuary Placin' . . . . .	510
Riotous Proceedings . . . . .	333
Riots, the Ross-shire . . . . .	371
Rutherford, Fragment from . . . . .	252
Schoolmasters of Scotland, the . . . . .	294
Settlements, Violent during the Reign of Moderatism . . . . .	224
Sinclair, Sir George, and the Disruption . . . . .	355
Skye, Isle of, Revival of Religion in the . . . . .	111
Spot, Impressions on the . . . . .	54
Sutherland, the Duke of . . . . . 230, 310,	413
Testimony, a Short but Honored . . . . .	427
Wallace, Rev. J., Extracts from an Address to his Parishioners, by the . . . . .	151
Why not help us? . . . . .	50
"Why Separate?" . . . . .	9
Wilson, Rev. Dr., of Bombay, Letter of to the Rev. Dr. Welsh, &c. . . . .	159

THE

# FREE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. I.]      FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1843.

[No. 1.

## I.—PASTORAL ADDRESS BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

### *INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS TO THE ADHERENTS OF THE FREE PROTESTING CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN CALCUTTA.*

DEAR CHRISTIAN FRIENDS AND BRETHREN,

The grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST be with you all!

We earnestly commend to your attentive perusal, and serious consideration, the following Pastoral Address of the First General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. It was read to you from the Pulpit on last Lord's-Day, in accordance with its original design; and it is now conveyed to you in a shape more permanent and more conformable with its own real importance, in order that you may again at leisure peruse it, and also be able to circulate it for the general benefit.

This document is the fruit of a long protracted struggle in Scotland for the honour of CHRIST, and for the welfare of his Church; and in spirituality of tone and in boldness of utterance it is a production worthy of so noble a cause. The events to which it refers, the facts which it records, the principles which it maintains, the truths which it presents to view, are of paramount and lasting importance:—but, its chief glory is in its one peculiar object, which is to maintain the sole, supreme and universal KINGSHIP OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST over the Christian Church, and that in respect to all its spiritual or ecclesiastical acts and relations;—for all these must be regulated by His word or law. This is no new principle, but an old one that was from the beginning:—It is also a principle which has often been contended for, even unto death, ever since the age of the Cross; and in no land with more zeal and self-sacrifice than in Scotland, in former days, as well as now. We now, in this distant land, by very near sympathies, are required in our turn, to take part and to choose our side in this vital contest between CHRIST and the world, between the LORD'S Church and the powers of this earth. May the LORD grant that we all be found faithful, occupying the post in which we could desire to be found by HIM, were He now to appear from Heaven the second time, to judgment!

We here make no particular reference to the *local* circumstances which constrained us to form in Calcutta a distinct congregation in connexion with

the Free Church of Scotland : these are recorded in our "STATEMENT OF RECENT PROCEEDINGS," which will issue from the press together with this "ADDRESS," and will fully explain the circumstances under which we have hitherto moved. Suffice it to say, that, urged on by a conviction of duty, and guided by the developement of providence, we could find no intermediate resting-place between separation from the old and the constitution of the new. In this procedure the LORD is our Judge, and to His infallible judgment we make our appeal, amidst all our consciousness of manifold infirmity.

FRIENDS AND BRETHREN!—Ours is a serious responsibility, even as ours is a glorious cause ; and we must act accordingly. Read your BIBLES more than ever before ; for you have now a new and increased necessity to know your Lord's will :—PRAY more than ever before ; for you have now an additional share of your Lord's cause to maintain :—Be HOLIER than ever before, for you have made yourselves more conspicuous by your recent separation from others :—Be more SELF-DENIED than ever before, for you have now a work of larger sacrifice to perform :—LOVE CHRIST more than ever before ; for He has honoured you by posting you more near to His own Kingly Standard :—Rely more on the HOLY SPIRIT ; for you will have now a greater array of opposition and temptation to encounter :—Walk more with GOD, as your most merciful and wise FATHER in Heaven, than ever before ; for you have now more of His glory to shew forth upon earth, before an ungodly world, and amidst halting brethren !

"Now unto HIM that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy—To the only wise GOD OUR SAVIOUR, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever ! Amen."

• Yours sincerely and affectionately in the Lord,

ALEXANDER DUFF.  
WILLIAM S. MACKAY.  
DAVID EWART.  
JOHN MACDONALD.  
THOMAS SMITH.

*Ministers of the Free Church of Scotland.*

*Calcutta, 6th September, 1843.*

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN IN THE LORD,

When the judgments of God are abroad in the earth,—when these judgments have begun at the house of God,—when our holy and our beautiful place, in which our fathers worshipped God, is burnt with fire, and all our pleasant things are laid waste,—it is the duty, in a spirit of deep and solemn earnestness, of those who are set as watchmen in Zion, to sound an alarm, to proclaim aloud the danger, and to warn every man to call upon the Lord, who answereth the prayers of his believing people, though it be by terrible things in righteousness.

There are times, beloved brethren, when God seems to make special manifestation of his sovereignty and power, as if for the express

purpose of constraining men to know that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. In such times, men scheme and devise ; but their schemes prove abortive, and their devices end in disappointment. Human wisdom exerts itself to the utmost, and its efforts terminate in vanity and vexation of spirit. Institutions the most valuable are overthrown, and what seemed most firmly established is swept away. When such events are taking place around us, surely we should do well to mark their solemn meaning, and to hear in them the voice which says, "Be still, and know that I am God ; I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth."

We cannot doubt that you well know the events to which we allude. A great calamity has befallen us, affecting our nation, our Church, and the families of our land. The Church of our fathers is rent asunder. That portion of it which faithfully adhered to the Word of God, and to its own fundamental principles and constitutional standards,—which strove equally to maintain purity of discipline, and to defend the rights and liberties of the Christian people,—has been constrained to forego the advantages of the Establishment, rather than submit to the surrender of principle and the violation of conscience.

Long was it the peculiar distinction and high glory of the Established Church of Scotland to maintain the sole Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, His exclusive sovereignty in the Church, which is His kingdom and house. It was ever held by her, indeed, that the Church and the State, being equally ordinances of God, and having certain common objects, connected with His glory and the social welfare, might and ought to unite in a joint acknowledgment of Christ, and in the employment of the means and resources belonging to them respectively, for the advancement of His cause. But while the Church, in this manner, might lend her services, to the State, and the State give its support to the Church, it was ever held as a fundamental principle, that each still remained, and ought, under all circumstances, to remain, supreme in its own sphere, and independent of the other. On the one hand, the Church having received her powers of internal spiritual government directly from her Divine Head, it was held that she must herself, at all times, exercise, the whole of it, under a sacred and inviolable responsibility to Him alone, so as to have no power to fetter herself, by a connection with the State or otherwise, in the exercise of her spiritual functions. And in like manner, in regard to the State, the same was held to be true, on the same grounds, and to the very same extent, in reference to its secular sovereignty. It was maintained that, as the spiritual liberties of the Church, bequeathed to her by her Divine Head, were entirely beyond the control of the State, so, upon the other hand, the State held directly and exclusively from God, and was entitled and bound to exercise, under its responsibility to Him alone, its entire secular sovereignty, including therein whatever it was competent for, or binding upon, the State to do about sacred things, or in relation to the Church,—as, for example, endowing and establishing the Church, and fixing the terms and conditions of that Establishment.



But these simple and broad principles, beloved brethren, on the refusal by the Legislature of the "Church's Claim of Right," agreed to by the General Assembly of 1842, left us no alternative but either to cast off our duty to our only King and Head, or to resign our position as an Establishment. For the decisions of the Supreme Civil Courts had annexed conditions to that position, to which, had they been proposed to the Church at the time of her first entering into it, she could not lawfully have consented,—conditions subversive of the distinct spiritual government established by Christ in His Church, subversive of the essential liberties of his redeemed people, subversive of the constitutional rights of the Church of Scotland, as fixed by the Revolution Settlement, and solemnly guaranteed by the Act of Secularity, and the Treaty of Union between the kingdoms. Fully acknowledging, however, the competency of the Legislature, under its responsibility to God alone, to fix the conditions of her establishment, the Church presented to the State her "Claim of Right" to be protected in her sacred liberties, against what she deemed the oppressive and unconstitutional encroachments of the Civil Courts. Her claim was expressly and deliberately refused. The Legislature placed its seal on the conditions under which the Courts had declared that the temporalities of the Church were henceforward to be held. With these conditions we could not in conscience comply. And having, therefore, obtained grace to be faithful in the time of trial, we have been made willing, for the principles bequeathed to us by our martyred forefathers, to take cheerfully the spoiling of our goods, and to submit to the loss of all things, rather than make shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience. In deepest humility we adore the goodness and mercy of God, who has given us that grace wherein we stand. And we further adore that mysterious Providence, which has mingled with this trial so many and singular tokens of loving-kindness and grace, that we are constrained this day to invite you to give thanks to God along with us, and to exclaim, "The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad."

How shall we be grateful enough to the Giver of all good, for that unbroken unity in bearing witness to the truth, which, from the beginning of this struggle, has been drawn only the closer, and made the more firm and immovable, by every new effort put forth to weaken and destroy it? Truly "this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." What signal cause of gratitude, that, at each successive stage of the conflict, and especially as it approached its crisis, the way of the Church's duty was made so plain and clear,—often by means of the very events that, for a time, threatened to be the most disastrous,—that it seemed as if we heard a voice behind us saying, "This is the way, walk ye in it," and we were made to know that the Lord had accomplished the desire of his people—"Teach me thy way, O Lord, and lead me in a plain path, because of mine enemies?" When, at last, the disruption of the Church arrived, how wonderfully, in ways too numerous to be even mentioned here, did a gracious Providence so order the whole circumstances, that our sorrow was turned very much

into joy,—our apprehensions and fears swallowed up in bright and cheering anticipations, that the Lord would make “the things which had happened to us, to fall out unto the furtherance of the gospel.”

Nor let it be forgotten, but acknowledged with lively gratitude to God, that although this grievous calamity has befallen our beloved Church in a time of abounding iniquity, yet it has taken place in a time of reviving faithfulness,—in a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. And while the existence of the iniquity cannot but make the danger the greater, the revival at the same time, of spirituality and faithfulness, affords much reason to hope that the language of Providence respecting our Church is, “destroy it not, for a blessing is in it.” It need not be thought strange, that a time of reviving faithfulness should be also a time of trial. In God’s dealings with His Church in past ages, we find that the trial usually came not till the revival had first come. In this we adore the mercy and the wisdom of God. Had such a time of trial overtaken us when our Church was sunk in lukewarmness and spiritual lethargy, it would have seemed as if the Lord were about to cast us, as a withered branch, into the fire. We are very prone to misinterpret the meaning of God’s dealings with His Church. We pray to be made conformed to Christ, forgetting that He was “made perfect through sufferings,” and that we too, if we are to be glorified with Him, must know “the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death.” It is the certain appointed lot of all believers, “that the trial of their faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, may be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ.”

But, beloved brethren, though our afflictions have thus been mingled with manifold and memorable tokens of divine loving-kindness, not the less, on that account, are we called to see in them, and to acknowledge with deepest humiliation before God, those sins of our Church and country, which have deserved and procured them at His hand, as we have at large reminded you on several former occasions. Nor yet is the Lord the less narrowly searching and trying each of us, not only as to what we have been in the past, but as to what we mean to be,—on whose side we are to be found—for the Lord or against Him, in this time of trial. It is an old device of Satan to draw the distinction between truth and error so sharp and narrow that it seems almost invisible, forming, as it were, a twilight, where light melts into shade, so that the eye can scarce tell whether light or darkness prevails. Yet light has no fellowship with darkness; and however sharp the line may be, on the one side of it is God’s truth, on the other Satan’s delusion. Think it not a light matter which part you take in this controversy. Rest assured that it much concerns your own growth in grace and spirituality of mind, as well as the honour of the Lord Jesus Christ. If it be truth, as we most firmly believe, that “the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of Church-officers, distinct from the Civil Magistrate,”

then it must be sinful to subject that government to the dominion of any other power, or to regulate the actings of it by any other standard than God's Word alone. We do not wish to involve you in the intricacies of subtle argument and doubtful disputation; but it is the duty of every man to be able to render a reason of the hope that is in him. The time has been when the people of Scotland were well acquainted with the controversy respecting Christ's crown, and the free and independent spiritual jurisdiction of his Church. There is one simple and comprehensive way in which the subject may be stated and rendered abundantly intelligible. Whatever a Church of Christ must do, in order to preserve its existence, and discharge its whole duties to its divine Head, it must continue to do in all circumstances,—in adversity or in prosperity, when persecuted or when supported, established by the State, or disestablished. It must be at liberty to obey Christ alone in all that He has appointed or commanded; to admit, censure, or cut off, alike office-bearers and ordinary members, according to the principles and precepts of His Word. As no favour which the Civil Magistrate may show to the Church can give him any right to usurp an authority, in reference to spiritual matters, beyond what he is otherwise entitled to claim, so neither can the Church be justified in continuing to accept his favour, on condition of rendering to him submission and subjection, beyond what she would feel herself at liberty to render to a Christian magistrate, whether she enjoyed his favour or not. And if she consent thus to forfeit her liberty for any earthly good, she does to that extent violate her allegiance to Christ, and suffer her union with Him, as her living Head, to be severed or impaired. The question is not even, whether, in such a case, an equal amount of blessing can be hoped for (though it should not seem difficult to determine that question); but the simple question is, whether such a surrender can be made without sin. This is the test, dear brethren, to which the Lord has now brought each of us. No man can avoid meeting and grappling with it. We warn you, with all earnestness and affection, to beware lest Satan sift you as wheat, and tempt you to deny your Lord and Master.

We know well that the solemn and awful character of the present times and events will be glossed over; and that attempts will be made to deceive you by all manner of plausible evasions. Be not deceived by those who tell you that the present controversy is respecting a matter of minor importance,—of mere Church government,—a point not necessary to salvation. It wears, indeed, the aspect of a matter of Church government. But, besides involving, by unavoidable consequence, the character and qualifications of the Christian ministry, and thus, in effect, the promulgation of all doctrines together, it directly and essentially involves no less a question than this,—Shall Christ be King in Zion, or shall He not? Shall Christ be the sole Head of the Church, which is His body, or shall He not? Shall His Word be the only authoritative rule of the Church's government, or shall it not? If He is King in Zion, who shall interfere with the liberties He has granted to the subjects of His free spiritual kingdom?

If His Word be the only law of that kingdom, can His servants, without treason against Him, enter into any alliance involving the acknowledgment of another rule in the administration of its affairs,—such as the mandates of a civil tribunal, not professing even to regulate its procedure by the Word of God, but avowedly sitting to determine civil affairs according to human statute?

Neither be deceived by the use of the word Schism, which has been, and will often be, employed by adversaries. Schism is a sinful, because an unnecessary separation from the Church. But there is not here, properly speaking, a separation from the Church at all. Whatever, in the eye of law, may henceforth constitute the Church of Scotland, assuredly that Church, in the eye of conscience, and of the Lord of conscience,—that Church, while yet acting freely and without coercion of the civil power, pledged itself before God and the world, in its “Claim of Right,” to renounce the Establishment rather than submit to those conditions which have since been imposed. It has now only redeemed its pledge. It is the Church, properly speaking, which has separated from the State. Assuredly this is not schism. And those are the true and only schismatics who, by refusing to take the same step when duty required it, have thus, and thus only, caused the disruption of the Church.

In like manner, you will not be deluded by the supplicating cry, “How can you quit the Church of your fathers?” The Church of your fathers is that Church which holds the principles that they held, which bears the testimony that they bore, and which is now suffering in the cause of that great truth for which they suffered. Where was the Church of your fathers during the twenty-eight years of persecution which desolated the land two centuries ago? Was it where Prelacy held sway, and where curates occupied the pulpits from which the martyr-ministers had been expelled: Or was it with the persecuted Covenanters, on the waste heaths and moorlands, among the wild glens and mountain-solitudes, which Welsh and Blackadder, with Cameron and Peden, with Cargill and Renwick? You cannot otherwise quit the Church of your fathers than by cleaving to the present Establishment, which no longer retains the principles for which your fathers bore their testimony even unto death. You cannot otherwise remain members of the Church of your fathers, than by adhering to those who are following their footsteps, renewing their testimony, and preparing, like them, to encounter every kind and degree of suffering and danger in defence of the Redeemer’s crown.

One other plausible argument with which you may be addressed is the assertion that we ought to follow the example of our fathers, who in all former struggles, never left the Church till they were forcibly ejected. In answer to this, let it be observed, that they were in circumstances totally different from those in which we are placed. During their days, religious toleration, such as we enjoy, was unknown. There was no such thing then, as leaving the Establishment, and having freedom to preach the gospel out of it. The claim of the Civil Power was that of a universal supremacy over the Church of

Christ,—supremacy in all causes civil and ecclesiastical. Between such a claim, and the leaving of the Establishment, had that been possible, there was no connection. The one only step left to our forefathers, was to resist the Civil Power in its interference with conscience, and take the consequences. It is far otherwise with us who have a ground of freedom still left us in the Constitution, without the pale of the Establishment. If still we remain in it, acquiescing in the unlawful conditions, of course we betray the sole sovereignty of Christ in his Church. If we remain in it resisting them, we not only, to all practical purposes, betray that sovereignty, but we dishonourably cling to the emoluments of the State, while we refuse compliance with the express conditions on which they are bestowed.

Finally, dearly beloved in the Lord, suffer us to remind you that the Lord Jesus is the Head of every man,—of every true believer,—and that those only can faithfully and truly maintain His Headship over the Church, who are themselves united to Him as their own living Head. Let us urgently entreat you to commune with your own hearts and be still,—to ponder the ways of God,—to mark the leadings of His Providence,—and to pray earnestly and incessantly for present light and grace to enable you to see and understand present truth, to guide and support you in present duty, and to prepare and strengthen you for present trial. This is manifestly a time when God is making a great work, and probably a short work, in the earth. The powers of good and evil seem mustering for a final struggle. The deadly wound of the Antichristian beast seems to be healed, and, closely leagued with infidelity, he advances to the conflict. We speak not now of contests between parties in the Church, or between the Church and the Civil Courts, but of the last grand conflict between the powers of light and darkness. We believe that the chief effect of our contests has been of a preliminary nature,—that they have served to bring forward opposing principles of still greater importance than themselves, and to commence a struggle by which all Europe will yet be convulsed. We would not rashly interpret the will and the purposes of God. But it would seem as if the Christian Church, whose chief testimony, in the early ages of the gospel, was on behalf of the prophetic office of Christ, which the Jews refused to admit, and the Gentiles long resisted,—and in the ages thereafter, on behalf of His Priestly office, which the Antichristian apostacy disowned and denied,—were now called to bear witness, more especially, for the third great office of Christ, that of sole King in Zion, and Prince of the kings of the earth. Hitherto, the Church of Scotland has been the only Church that has openly and avowedly, in the midst of suffering, stood forward to bear testimony in defence of this royal office. Well nigh three centuries are past since she first became witness for it. She has often suffered in its defence; and she is called to suffer for it now again. Surely the hand of God is here. Surely it is our duty and our wisdom to follow where He leads,—to take our position where He directs,—and to stand still there, waiting to see the salvation of God. Let us bear our great testimony as He may be pleased to appoint;

and, in the meanwhile, let us labour zealously in rebuilding the walls of our prostrate Zion, though in troublous times, till the top-stone be brought forth with shoutings,—“ Grace, grace, unto it,” and everlasting glory to Him who is King of Zion, “ King of kings, and Lord of lords.”

## II.—“ WHY SEPARATE ? ”

“ **WHY SEPARATE ?** Hold your opinions as you will, on these church matters—but, *Why separate ?* ” Such is the question with which the adherents of the Free Church of Scotland in this city are now very generally met.

The question is evidently a very weak one ; but it is put with much force, as if it were unanswerable, or at least very difficult of answer ; and as a particle of dust driven by a strong wind may injure the human eye, that it can scarcely see, so a weak question asked with great confidence, may seriously affect a mind that is sensitive from conscious deficiency or from natural timidity. It is therefore right that the question should be plainly and boldly answered—and also, *fully* ; and we shall in the few following notes, endeavour to give an outline, in orderly sequence, of the grounds on which the “ Free Church-men ” in Calcutta, have taken up their present peculiar position.

### WHY SEPARATE ?

1. **WE SEPARATE, as Christians,** because it is the very first law of our being, as such, to adhere supremely to the LORD JESUS CHRIST ; and therefore to separate ourselves from every object, interest, or relation, that opposes us, or will not permit us, in any one point to adhere fully to HIM, as the Saviour of the world or as the Head of the Church. If a Christian at any time discover, that his position is inconsistent or irreconcilable with the full claims of CHRIST as His Lord, he must labour to have that position altered so as to become perfectly consistent and reconcilable with those claims ; or, failing in that, he must at once retire. This law of a separative adherence to our Great LORD must be understood as a preliminary to any particular act of separation ;—and we, finding ourselves in circumstances that required decision, have separated from a counteracting relationship, that we might adhere to CHRIST as our sole ecclesiastical LORD.

2. **WE SEPARATE, as Church-members,** because we would avoid the sins of heresy and schism—heresy as to the *Head* of the Church, schism as to its *members*. Holding as we do, that it has ever been the doctrine of our Church, that CHRIST is supreme in that Church and is its sole Head—in accordance with whose law as contained in

His word, and as administered by His own servants, all church matters, or spiritual acts, are to be performed and administered; and holding also, as we do, that the unity of the body, arises from union to CHRIST the HEAD, and will ever be in direct proportion to the closeness and extent of that union, and therefore that whatever affects the union affects also the mutual unity;—we must also further hold, that all false doctrine as to the Head, involves a schism in the body; and as we would avoid the *heresy* of compromising the supremacy of Christ, as we would avoid the *schism* of joining with those who make such compromise, we have forsaken those who are in error, and have joined ourselves to those who are walking (as to this point) in the truth. Thus also it is further evident that if we have separated from a community of our fellow Christians because they have surrendered their KING's prerogatives, and their brethren's rights and liberties, then surely, *they*, not we, are in schism; and they, not we, are in danger of Erastian heresy—a heresy that would ultimately place the sceptre of Christ in the hands of Cæsar.

3. WE SEPARATE, as *Church-establishment men*, from the State; not because we hold such establishments to be unscriptural, inexpedient or impossible; nay, rather, we hold that, in a pure and independent form, they constitute the strength and glory of Christian nations, and believe that they will yet be the glory of the whole world: But, because the British State now denies all spiritual independence, to the Church as established by law in Scotland; and has by its various Civil Courts, subordinate and supreme, avowedly sanctioned and encouraged judicial interferences with almost every one of the Church's functions, so that of late not one of these could be performed without liability to secular coercion, and civil penalties\*. In such a case, however

\* In proof of this, take the following extract from the "REASONS OF PROTEST AND SEPARATION" read and presented at Edinburgh, in the General Assembly held, May 18th, 1843.—The Legislature has now declared,—

"1st. That the Courts of the Church as now established, and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the Civil Courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions, and in particular in their admission to the office of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the pastoral relation, and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations in opposition to the fundamental principles of the Church and their views of the word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.

"2nd. That the said Civil Courts have power to interfere with, and interdict the preaching of, the Gospel and administration of ordinances as authorized and enjoined by the Church Courts of the Establishment.

"3rd. That the said Civil Courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the Church Courts of the Establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

"4th. That the said Civil Courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the Church Courts of the Establishment, deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry, and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probationers—restoring them to the spiritual office and status of which the Church Courts have deprived them.

strong our belief in the expediency and excellency of Church establishments in the abstract, we feel that we can no longer remain in ecclesiastical alliance with the state;—because the supremacy of CHRIST in His Church is disputed, and spiritual freedom of that Church itself is denied, whilst human authority and secular fetters are substituted in their stead. In such circumstances the Church, by the first law of her being, must burst her bond and dissolve her convention, renounce her endowments, depart from the State, adhere to Christ, and become a "FREE CHURCH"—free to obey His every command and exercise her every function, save when the hand of violence may prevent. She at least will be no party to her own bondage.

4. WE SEPARATE, as *Members of the Church of Scotland*, from that Church as *now* established by law, because it has ceased to be what it formerly was understood to be, ecclesiastically free, spiritually independent. It has admitted, and now acknowledges, in its establishment frame, a new element, contrary to all our former beliefs and convictions on the subject, contrary to the judgments of five hundred of its best and ablest ministers who have left its communion, and who had remained so long within an establishment, because they ever regarded it in theory, and (with some small and diminishing exceptions) in operation also, as a FREE Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. But *now* she has accepted of secular bondage—she holds her ministerial ordinations, her ministerial depositions, her ministerial representation in Church courts, and in short every function that can be construed to involve a civil consequence, at the mercy of civil courts, and under coercion of the secular power. She has thus yielded up to man, by an avowed and recorded assent of positive submission, the ecclesias-

"5th. That the said Civil Courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the Supreme and other Judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said Judicatories.

"6th. That the said Civil Courts have power to supersede the majority of a Church Court of the Establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a Church Court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in opposition to the Court itself, and to the superior Judicatories of the Establishment.

"7th. That the said Civil Courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before Courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such Courts from proceeding therein.

"8th. That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the Church Courts of the Establishment and allowed to rule, as well as to teach, agreeable to the institution of the office by the Head of the Church, nor to sit in any of the Judicatories of the Church, inferior or supreme, and that no additional provision can be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among members of the Church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests, and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline in a parish, without the coercion of a Civil Court.

"All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said Civil Courts severally above specified, whatever proceeding may have given occasion to its exercise, is, in our opinion, in itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, with the authority which the Head of the Church hath conferred on the Church alone."



ical supremacy of CHRIST her HEAD, and the spiritual freedom of her Church-officers and members:—so is she now a bond-woman, whose children we are *not*:—and therefore we leave her to go to the Free-woman, who is the mother of us all. We believe that the Residuary Establishment has sinned, and for its sin we separate.

5. WE SEPARATE *from any particular congregation* of that establishment, on the principle, as clear as Euclid's axioms, that the whole consists of the parts—that therefore we cannot separate from the whole, but by separating from each and all of its parts. In this case too, from the very unity which pervades presbyterianism, the sin of the whole becomes the sin of the parts, unless protested and contended against, because each of the parts is sworn into the whole by solemn vow of subscription:—all ministers and elders are under *vow* to maintain the Church as it is, in its several courts and relations, and are bound to give effect to its acts and decrees, if they do not declare against them, and take the consequences of disobedience. Every congregation which by its ministry and eldership stands united to the Residuary Scottish Establishment, is of necessity incorporated with that sinful error which now constitutes, after years of controversy, and a deliberate choice, the distinctive basis, and the express condition of its established existence.

6. WE SEPARATE, *from the congregation of St. Andrew's Kirk in Calcutta*, because it is, in every possible way, ecclesiastically incorporated with that established Church of Scotland from which first we have in principle separated. Its ministers and elders have been sworn, by ordination vows, into ecclesiastical obedience to all its courts:—acts of Assembly and acts of Parliament, have declared the jurisdiction of the established Church to be the very basis of its peculiar existence:—it has hitherto remained thus identified with the Residuary Church, sworn through the ordination vows of its office-bearers, to uphold its present constitution as by the Legislature of Britain now interpreted and declared (against which they have in no form protested):—nay more, when its ruling elders requested to have a meeting of Session called, in order to consider what was their duty at this solemn crisis, the Moderator of Session, the senior Minister of the congregation, denied them this first of all their official rights, and refused to his co-presbyters the opportunity of considering the matter as rulers in the Church; and thus compelled them by strong hand to withdraw. We may also mention here, one other fact—In virtue of the proceedings and acts of the last General Assembly of the Church of Scotland against the seceding ministers, no seceding minister can be invited or permitted to preach in any pulpit of the Scottish Establishment. In Calcutta the same acts have effect, and the same results must follow. The ministers of St. Andrew's Kirk DARE NOT (even if they *would*) invite any of the five ordained Missionaries of the Free Church of Scotland now in Calcutta to preach in their pulpit, or take part in any one public act that involved an acknowledgement of their ministry before the congre-

gation, without a breach of Church law and exposure to Church discipline. How, with all these things before us could we but separate? and so separate, that our constitution, rights, privileges, functions and officers might, both on principle and in practice, be ours again—ours, by the constitution of a **FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH** in connexion with the **FREE PROTESTING CHURCH OF SCOTLAND**.

7. **WE SEPARATE**, because we see that ultimately will arise from such separation certain **BENEFITS** not otherwise to be obtained—benefits to ourselves and others—and benefits which will richly repay the sacrifice made to purchase them. Such a benefit is that peace of conscience which results from being no longer identified in our church-relationship with the evil which we condemn:—Such a benefit, is that freedom of spirit and action which results from consistency of practice and conduct with theory and principle:—Such a benefit is the embodiment, in a palpable form, of a vital and paramount principle of truth, such as, that *Christ is the sole head of the Church*:—Such a benefit is the stirring up of a spirit of enquiry after the truth of those principles of Christ's Church, on account of which we have been compelled to break through many of the dearest and strongest bonds of human and Christian life:—Such a benefit is this, that, by our new congregational form, we may be enabled to preserve alive until better and more spiritual times, a germ of *Church-life*, which we have no doubt will vegetate and grow and fill the land with fruit to the glory of Christ our Lord:—and finally, there is this crowning benefit, that with the maintenance of a grand *peculiar* truth, there will also be conjoined a new spring of *universal* evangelical truth, in a land and in a city, in which gospel teaching cannot be too much multiplied—this is as the kindling of an additional lamp, on a better pedestal, to help the enlightening of a dark room.—After all this, surely *we may separate*!—and separating say, “**WHO IS HE THAT CONDEMNETH?**”

### III.—HOME INTELLIGENCE AND SELECTIONS.

#### I.—THE REVD. DR GORDON'S ADDRESS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE 19TH MAY,

*explanatory of his Reasons for Separation from the Establishment.*

Moderator, I felt quite assured before my friend Dr. Buchanan rose, that he would leave me little to say; but I must confess that he has left me far less than I had even *hoped* he would have left. (Laughter.) He has exhausted the subject, in so far as he has expressed the principles and explained the grounds on which our proceedings of yesterday rested. The deep solemnity and painful nature of these proceedings all must have felt,—the momentous

consequences none can foresee; but it is some, nay, abundant consolation to think, that whatever consequences that step may involve, we had no alternative. (Cheers.) We had no alternative, because I cannot state it as an alternative to Christian ministers and Christian elders, to relinquish and abandon those principles which in our consciences we believe to be based upon the Word of God. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We had therefore no alternative; and nothing but principle, and the consciousness that we were contending for principle and for the Word of God, could have induced us to continue the painful and harassing, and I may now at last say, the hopeless contest in which we have so long been engaged. I can say for my reverend fathers and myself,—in opposition to all the charges that have been made against us, that we were leagued together in partisanship,—that we were committed to no party, and never on grounds of principle could have abandoned our friends. It will not now do to say that we were actuated by partizanship, and that we were bound to each other as a party, and could not leave our friends; that would be a motive degrading even to the politicians of this world, and how much more unworthy would it be of Christian men and Christian office-bearers. (Great applause.) We continued the controversy because we could not help it,—we could not surrender our privileges because they were not ours to surrender—(tremendous cheering)—they have been bestowed upon the Christian Church by its Great Head. He has conferred them upon us, and they are not ours to retain or relinquish as we might find it convenient. (Great applause.) But more than this, we believed these privileges to have been secured by the State when it took us into connection with itself: we thought that the State gave effect to our liberties and privileges; we believed that it put us on vantage ground, because the State believed we would do her service while we were serving our Lord and Master; and, therefore, as Ecclesiastical Courts recognised by the State as an integral part of the Constitution of this land, we would not surrender at the bidding of the Civil Courts what we believed the State had promised to protect us in. We refused to take the opinions of the Civil Courts, as determining whether or no the recognition of the State was to be continued or withdrawn. We would take no opinions from the Civil Courts on that question, till we went to the State itself, and asked the State whether she understood the condition of our Establishment to be what the Civil Courts had declared it to be. We went therefore to the State, and she told us that the statutes on which she founded should be interpreted as the Civil Courts had interpreted them,—that is to say, that the only conditions on which we could retain the advantage of an Establishment is this, That in the event of a collision taking place between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts, the Civil Courts shall ultimately have the sole power of determining the question, not merely in their own matters, and to dispose of civil matters involved, but also over the Ecclesiastical Courts themselves, so that the Civil Courts shall be entitled to coerce by pains and penalties Ecclesiastical Courts. (Hear.) This is the decision we have got. Now, the decision of the State does not alter our relation or our responsibility to Christ. (Hear, hear.) The authority of the State does not authorise us to transfer to Civil Courts those privileges and that power which he has bestowed on the office-bearers in his Church for the government thereof, distinct from the Civil Magistrate. (Hear.) And therefore, if the State says that the only condition on which we can retain the benefits of the Establishment, is on the principles they have laid down; I say we have no alternative but to relinquish the connection. Sir, it is a most miserable subterfuge I have heard pleaded that we might have remained in the Established Church, and there retained intact our theoretical opinions, and we might have there risen solemnly to protest as often as the Civil Court actually interfered with ecclesiastical procedure, and that in

this way our consciences might have been satisfied ; yes, that subterfuge is one that I tremble to think of a Christian man allowing himself for a single moment to entertain. (Hear, hear.) Why, the very fact of our drawing our stipends after the declaration which the State has made, is, on our part, a solemn promise, as honest men, to the State, that we never will make such a declaration, and is an acquiescence in the principle ; and a protest after that, would be a dishonest, a hypocritical protest. (Cheers.) There is no other alternative. The conscience of every one of us has shut us out on both sides. On the one side, if we had remained in the Establishment, and held by our principles, to protest would have been dealing falsely and dishonestly with the State. We would have been taking the benefit on a totally different ground from that on which the State said it would give it. (Hear.) On the other hand, if we had remained in the Establishment, and submitted, we must have abandoned our allegiance to the great Head of the Church. (Cheers.) This I feel to be my position, or rather felt it to be my position ; but, thank God, I breathe in a better atmosphere than I have done for years back. (Loud cheers.) I was not insensible to the taunts with which we were everywhere met,—the taunt that, as honest men, we should leave the Establishment. (Hear.) It was very wearisome and fatiguing,—very exhausting even for the ablest of our men to be day after day defending us and themselves from that charge. It was still more painful perhaps for many like me, who had not the power nor the qualifications to make that defence, to be remaining in silence, and hearing ourselves treated as men rebellious against the powers that be. (Hear.) We were all conscious of the injustice of this charge ; we had the *mens conscia recti*, and that was our consolation. Still the trials were severe. But I feel now that *I am free man*. (Loud applause.) Nay, Sir, I am not only a free man, but I am entitled to say to my adversaries, who have twitted me so often with dishonesty, and whatever they may think of the bearing with which I say it, I say it with a very humble heart, and full of gratitude to Almighty God, I can say to them, I am an honest man. (Great applause.) I have given what ought to satisfy you at least, that I am an honest man ; I have sacrificed my all, except the promise of my Heavenly Father who, will bring me support for myself and my children through the beneficence of his own people, who have been turned from darkness to light. (Great cheering.) But the enemies who have twitted us with dishonesty, have no notion whatever of the trials of any principles, but simply of this, whether we will forego worldly advantages. By God's grace we have done that, and therefore we might say to them, “you must admit at least that we are honest men, though we may be very weak.” There is just one other point to which I would advert, and it is one that fills my heart with many bright anticipations. I am beginning to feel, with many others of my fathers and brethren around me, that advancing period of life when the little energy I might have had is beginning to flag, and when various intimations are given me that, at no very distant period, my labours must come to an end. In looking forward to such a time, I am cheered and comforted with the thought that God, in his great grace and mercy, is raising up a noble array of our young friends ready to occupy the places which we must soon quit ; and while I cannot but feel the deepest sympathy with my young friends in the prospect of the difficulties with which they must enter on their labours, compared with the peace and quietness with which I entered on mine, yet I do feel assured that the same gracious God who has enabled them, in spite of that hope so natural to youth, and which is far more calculated to lead away the mind than even the enjoyment of any of the good things of this life,—that God who has enabled them in the early part of their life to forego all the advantages to which they might naturally have looked forward, and to cast in their

lot with their aged fathers and brethren, to comfort and cheer our spirits in the decline of life,—why, Sirs, when I think of that, I feel I should be chargeable with a distrustful and most ungrateful faithlessness to the Head of the Church, if I did not feel confident that that God with still bless them as ministers of His Truth, if I did not look forward to bright days for this land, though they may be days of suffering and sadness; yes, bright days, through the gathering in of multitudes who shall be to them a crown of joy and rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus. I believe that the trials through which they will have to pass at the commencement of their warfare, will only have the effect of training them to that hardness which, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, they will have to maintain when they are brought into the field. I congratulate my young friends on the prospects before them, and I would call upon them to be humble minded, not to be carried away by the mere feeling and excitement of the moment, but to make it matter of thanks to God that He has enabled them to throw in their lot, and to be ready for any service He may be pleased to call them to. (During the delivery of the Rev. Doctor's address a deep feeling of solemnity pervaded the meeting.)

## 2.—FROM THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S PROCEEDINGS RELATIVE TO ITS FOREIGN MISSIONS.

---

Dr. CANDLISH said, I believe there is no formal Report to be given in from this Committee. Very obvious reasons will occur for this, but the Report before the Assembly is very plain. We have had a sufficient and ample account of the proceedings of this Committee in the Home and Foreign Missionary Record. Without any formal Report, therefore, from the Committee, we are all already familiar with its operations. The Home and Foreign Missionary Record, I have no doubt, is fully and faithfully circulated and read in all the parishes with which we are connected, so that no formal Report is necessary. It will, of course, be the mind of the Assembly that we should repeat our unfeigned thanks to Almighty God for the blessings which he has vouchsafed on the labours of our missionaries; and it will, no doubt, be the mind of the Assembly that a committee should now be appointed for the purpose of carrying on the same missionary schemes in the years to come. (Hear, hear.) I trust that the foreign schemes of our Protestant Church will be upheld and maintained with even increased efficiency, notwithstanding the demand for funds for our home operations, and that we will give proof to the Christian world, and even to the ungodly world, of the soundness of that maxim referred to by our Moderator a day or two ago, that home and foreign missionary associations mutually act and react on one another, and that the very increase of the sum received for our home operations, will be the pledge of a large increase in the fund available for foreign missions. (Hear.) It would ill become me to bestow any panegyric on the godly men whom the Lord has shut up in that field of foreign missions. I believe that I may very safely concur in the expressions of confidence which fell from my friend and brother Mr. Guthrie, a night or two ago, that we may reckon on having all the missionaries adhering to our Protestant Church. (Cheers.) At all events, it will be our duty to record, in reference to the missionaries in India, substantially what we have recorded in reference to the missionaries to the Jews,—that the Assembly continue to keep in their present offices all the missionaries who shall adhere to the Protestant Church of Scotland. (Cheers.) I feel it unnecessary to occupy the time of the Assembly at any greater length;

but I am sure we shall feel obliged to any of the fathers of this Assembly who may address us in reference to our present position as bearing on foreign missions. (Hear.) The Church is in a new position,—and, by the Church, I mean not only the ministers and elders, but the ordinary members of the Church,—and some may at first sight be apt to feel that a blow has been struck at our foreign missions that can scarcely be repaired. It were well that they should receive from this Assembly every encouragement to cherish and act upon the hope that this blow, so far from proving fatal to our foreign missions, will only put us in a position for prosecuting them more vigorously. No doubt we sustain a very considerable loss in regard to the funds, for the India Mission Committee was a wealthy Committee in comparison with some of the others. It had a considerable fund accumulated, as a fund in reserve to meet extraordinary expenses; and it had a very extensive building in Calcutta, prepared as a missionary house. Of course we must lay our account with losing both the buildings in Calcutta and the accumulated fund; but let us just remember, that the more the Church is thrown into the position in which it lives a daily pensioner on the daily bounty of her great Head,—the more she is brought into a position, in which, as respects home and foreign missionaries, she is called to live, as the saying is, from hand to mouth,—the more truly is she in a position in which she can rely most confidently on the blessing of Him who has taught us to say—“give us this day our daily bread.” (Hear.) We need not be anxious in regard to the future—“sufficient for the day is the evil thereof;” and especially in reference to the means for maintaining this great missionary enterprise, we may confidently presume that, if by maintaining our missionary zeal to the very utmost,—if by devising still more liberal things than in times past, we thus seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, all things else shall be freely added to us. (Cheers.) I would only say, before sitting down, that I am happy to have this opportunity of announcing that a new number of the Home and Foreign Missionary Record will be ready to be issued by the time of the rising of the Assembly, or, at least, within a week or so after it, in connection with our Protestant Church. (Cheers.) We shall thus, I trust, if we cannot serve ourselves heirs to the accumulated wealth of the Committee of the old Establishment, serve ourselves heirs to what is far more valuable than their wealth,—to the men whom God has raised up for this holy work, to the means of prosecuting that work, so far as these depend on the liberality which God puts into the heart of his people, and to the instrumentality by which the zeal of our people has mainly kept up the regular periodical issue of information on this subject. (Cheers.) I would propose that the Assembly adopt a resolution substantially similar to what was adopted in reference to the Jewish missions, and resolve now to appoint a committee for conducting the foreign missions, and that they resolve also to continue in the present spheres those of the missionaries who may adhere to the Free Protestant Church. (Cheers.) And I trust that the zeal of our people in this great cause will shortly be stimulated by the temporary residence among us of our excellent friend, Dr. Wilson, from Bombay, and that from him and the other missionaries,—respecting one of whom, at least, there is a reverend father here to answer,—that from him and the other missionaries we shall not be long in receiving a cordial adherence to our cause. (Cheers.) I take the liberty of suggesting, also,—and it would be impossible for me to express what I feel in mentioning his name,—I propose that the Convener of the Committee be Dr. Gordon. (Great cheering.)

Dr. P. M'FARLAN having heard the motion of the Rev. Doctor, had much pleasure in seconding it. He did not believe that there was an individual present who did not follow the motion with his cordial approval, both from

its own merits, and from the eminent individual who was placed at the head of the Committee. There was not one of the Schemes of the Church which had awakened more interest than this, an interest which had been to a great extent produced by the ardour and devotedness of Dr. Duff. Indeed it was singular, in the course of the doings of Divine Providence, that the circumstance which rendered Dr. Duff's presence necessary in this country, viz. the effects of the hot climate upon his constitution, should have been the means of producing such an incalculable amount of good : and he did hope and trust, that the missionaries who had been engaged in India and elsewhere, would be disposed to unite with the Protestant Church of Scotland in the great and good work in which she was engaged. Whatever might be the determination of the missionaries, however, he had no hesitation in declaring that they should under God, be active and zealous in prosecuting the exalted object which the Committee had in view ; and he was well aware that their people would not be wanting in generous and liberal exertions towards the great work of evangelising the heathen.

### 3.—THE LAST SITTING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 30TH MAY 1843.

*[The spirit of power, and of love and of a sound mind, which marked all the proceedings of the memorable First General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, are admirably illustrated by the following concluding sentences of Dr. Chalmers' speech as Moderator, at the termination of its last sitting on the 30th day of May, 1843. The Assembly is appointed to meet again at Glasgow on the 18th of October.]* c

The work of a Christian Church, more especially if it have to be reared anew, is one in which both great wisdom and great activity are called for. The faculties both of mind and body have to be brought into requisition, and put on their most strenuous exercise, as in the construction of any other mechanism. There is need both for the devices of the heart and the doings of the hand, and so both for men of counsel and men of untiring labour. It is thus that both the deliberative and the active principles of our nature are brought into vigorous and animating play : and the danger is, lest, placing all our confidence on these—we look no further than to the resources of our own judgment and the strength of our own arm. Even in the erection of a merely human framework, as a system of economical or civil polity, neither its agents nor its contrivers (men, it may be, of the greatest natural sense and experience) are independent of God, though His unseen agency be seldom recognised by them. This want of such recognition is fatal to the prosperity of a Church, whether it has only to be kept up and kept a-going, or still more, be set up and set a-going. A signal discomfiture awaits us if we attempt this special work of the Lord, yet seek not to the Lord both for direction to guide and for courage to uphold us. Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it. Our labour will be vain, and the fruit of it a melancholy abortion, if labour without prayer.

On the other hand, there is danger, lest, in trusting to the efficacy of prayer, we should so trust to it alone as to feel that we are discharged from the toils of performance. There is a fanatical imagination of this sort, from which the Church has often suffered—proceeding, as it does, from a total misconception of the established and ordinary methods both of Providence and grace. It is the wisdom of God which directs all, yet this supersedes not the busy operations of the human understanding ; for it is by giving wis-

dom to those who ask it that he causes His designs to take effect. It is the strength of God which executes all, yet this supersedes not the strenuous forthputting, either of our own mental or bodily powers; for it is in and by these that He fulfils his pleasure, when He perfects His own strength in man's weakness, and so makes good His own declaration, that they who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. This law of co-operation between God and man is a principle of the divine government which meets us every where in the Bible—insomuch that Scripture history and Scripture doctrine are alike charged with it. It is most true that the devices of man's heart are many, and that the counsel of the Lord alone shall stand; yet it is by means of an inspiration which giveth understanding, and putteth right desires into the heart of man, that God brings His counsel to pass. The tabernacle in the wilderness was efficiently the product of a wisdom from on high, yet instrumentally the product of human skill, and of human hands; for God filled its artificer, Bezaleel, with His own spirit, "in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, to devise cunning works;" and not only to devise, but to do or "to work in all manner of workmanship." It is also true, that the silver and the gold are the Lord's, yet given often by Him through the channel of human liberality; and so a tabernacle was provided from the free offerings of the people, whom God had made willing-hearted in the day of His power. Man is a fellow-worker with God, because God works not without man, but in man, working in Him both to will and to do; and thus it is still his part to strive mightily, yet according to the grace of God working in him mightily. It is the Lord who buildeth the house, yet not by dispensing with the labour of men, but by so directing, and so strengthening, that they labour not in vain. To separate the divine from the human, or the human from the divine agency, is to put asunder the things which God himself hath joined. Labour is vain when it is labour without prayer, and prayer also is vain when it is prayer without labour.

It is only by the blessed union of both these,—the union of devout hearts with labour-doing hands,—that we can expect to steer our Church through her difficulties, or look for a season to her of prosperity and revival. We have many scriptural examples of such a gracious combination; but chief among these, perhaps, is that of Nehemiah in the Old Testament, and of Paul in the New; both as diligent in performance as if man did all, yet as dependent in prayer as if God did all. What busy and incessant labour,—what correspondence,—what care of all the Churches,—what journeyings from place to place,—what endurance of fatigue,—and what forthputting of severe exertion, both in the defence and furtherance of the Gospel,—at one time preaching its blessed truths till midnight,—at another pleading its maligned and persecuted cause before councils and governors. And yet what a life of continued wrestling with God,—what intermingling of supplications with his great and busy services, and, not satisfied to hold direct converse himself with God in the Heavens, how he cast himself on the intercessions of his own converts,—making interest with them, as it were, for the benefit of their petitions, and urging them to strive with him in prayer! "Brethren, pray for us." "You also helping together by prayer for us." "Praying always with all prayer and supplication, in the spirit, for all saints, and for me, that utterance may be given to me." "For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayers." "Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the spirit, that you strive together with me in your prayers to God for me." "I trust that through your prayers I shall be given to you." "Continue in prayer, praying also for us, that God would open to us a door of utterance." Such are the terms in which this great Apostle of the Gentiles threw himself on the intercessions of the Churches; and in this should we be the followers of Paul.



Prayer is the great aliment and upholder of the Church in all ages. The burden is great, both of our difficulties and manifold duties. But if we cast this burden on the Lord, He will sustain it. Prayer availeth much. In all our ways let us acknowledge Him, and he will direct our paths. He hath guided us on our way hitherto; and, even in the midst of hardships and discouragements from without, both blessed and cheered us with many tokens of His favour. He hath put it into the hearts of many in our behalf to make costly sacrifices, and to engage in the work and labour of love for the Church of our fathers. We can speak both of great sacrifices and great liberalities; but knowing that without the light of God's countenance from on high, all is vain and profitless, we desire to make public acknowledgment of our dependence upon Him, and to invite the co-operation of our people's thanksgivings and their prayers.

Prayer is often frustrated by its generality. Our petitions should be as special as are our necessities or our desires. We ought not to be satisfied with praying in the gross,—we should pray in detail,—telling distinctly, and specifically in this our solemn converse with God, what the things are which we pray for. It is thus alone that we give a body and a substantive reality to the exercise. It has been said, that our confessions should be as particular as are our sins, and so also ought our prayers to be as particular as are our wants,—otherwise we cannot look for the accomplishment of this promise, “*Whatsoever things ye ask in my name ye shall receive;*” nor do we fulfil the precept, “*In every thing by prayer and supplication make your requests known unto God.*” It is only thus that we make a real business or actual thing of our intercourse with Him who sitteth in the heavens, or recognise a grace and a providence from on high as having to do with the affairs of men.

The various exigencies of our Free Church will supply many subjects for prayer. Let us offer a few specimens of these, and they may suggest all the others, whether those relating to the good of the Church at large, or to the real interests and necessities of our own neighbourhood.

And to begin with an object of first necessity, greatly to be desired, and therefore mightily to be prayed for, let us lift our earnest and constant cry to the Giver of all that is needful, for guidance and grace to our Church's counsellors; and this not only that they may be directed aright in their arduous course, full of difficulty and peril, but that, saved from their own spirit, they may at all times act in the spirit of their Master in heaven, with a single-hearted desire for the glory of God and the good of men's souls. Their way is beset with many temptations to deviate from that wisdom which descendeth from above, and which, though first pure, is also peaceable, and gentle, and easy to be entreated. We speak not only of the heart-burnings and jealousies which are apt to break out among themselves; nor should we wonder at these aberrations of our distempered nature, seeing that we read even of Paul and Barnabas, that the contention was sharp between them. But we speak also of the peculiar tendencies, in our present controversial state, both to the language and the temper of asperity towards those who are without, and to whom also we are required, in an especial manner, to walk in wisdom,—Col. iv. 5. The chief part of this wisdom lies not in the devices of an ingenious policy (though required to be wise as serpents), but in meekness,—James iii. 17. And surely there is much to cool down the provocations to anger, in the consideration that so many of our adversaries withstand us, not in the spirit of malice, but of profoundest ignorance. Paul the persecutor obtained mercy, because what he did in fierce opposition to the Christians, was done ignorantly. But most affecting and impressive of all was our Saviour's expiring prayer,—“*Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.*”

But we should pray for the people, as well as office-bearers of our Church, that theirs might not be the vagrant love of novelty, or aught, as in this world's politics, like the affection of rivalry and partisanship, or at all the indignant spirit of a warfare against men, or whatever elae than a deep sense of duty towards God, an honest, humble, devoted, and entire religiousness. They will perhaps, at the hands of bitter adversaries, meet with much to try the strength and genuineness of their Christianity,—with taunts, and injuries, and crosses,—with the loss of business or profitable services,—with the alienation or desertion of relatives and old friends,—with the persecution of calumny or contempt, if not of direct violence to property or persons. Here, then, is room and exercise for the “patience of the saints. Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.” It was, indeed, a signal triumph of charity when the primitive Christians achieved a moral victory over their foes, not by resistance, but by suffering; and not only took joyfully the spoiling of their goods but could breathe out their lives in prayer for their executioners. Theirs was not the achievement of victories, but a strength above nature,—not a strength conjured up by human energy from the recesses of one's own spirit, but a strength fetched down from heaven by prayers,—a strength that is perfected in weakness, when the power of Christ is made to rest on the soul of the believer. (1. Cor. xii. 9.) Our prayers to God for the faithful adherents of truth and righteousness, should be that of Paul for his converts, “That they be strengthened with all might, according to His glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness.”

We have great reason to bless God for the readiness of our people to befriend and support the Free Church, and for their generous offerings in its cause. The silver and gold are the Lord's (Hag. ii. 8), yet given by human hands, and that under the impulse of human hearts turned by His power whithersoever He will. (Prov. xxi. 1.) He works in man both to will and to do of His good pleasure, and so prompts the desires, as well as provides for the deeds, of Christian generosity. His empire reaches to the unseen spirit,—to the world that is within, as well as to the visible world around us. It is not only He who fills the giver's hand, but it is He who actuates the giver's heart; and while the merely secular philanthropist but makes his request known unto man, it is our part in everything, and more especially in this, to make our requests known unto God. And we take a humble and limited view of our enterprize, if we confine it to a provision for ejected ministers, or for the relief and sustentation of their families. Our object, in all the fulness of its ultimate accomplishment, is not only to repair the desolations, of our sanctuary, but to replenish the long-neglected wastes both in town and in country, of our beloved Scotland. We feel that we should attempt great things, and should hope great things; but most assuredly all our attempts will turn out to be abortive, and all our hopes, but the mockery of a vision, unless we pray for great things. In particular, we should pray that God would so pour forth of His own free and munificent spirit, as both to multiply and enlarge the liberalities of our people, and thus bring them nearer to the standard of our blessed Saviour's example who, though rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might be made rich. And here, who knows but that the most illustrious of all conquests might be awaiting us, over even the deadliest of our adversaries? Let us hope yet, in humble dependence on the grace which cometh from above, that by the labours of a free, and extended, and well supported ministry of the gospel, a Christian, and so a quiet and orderly population, may at length spring up under our hands; and that, by the exhibition of a result so precious, prejudice and hostility might in time be disarmed, and even our now most bitter opponents, when they come to

understand our principles and views, might at length be reconciled to them. We are daily misunderstood and misconstrued at present ; but still let us cherish the confidence, that when our ways please God, He will make even our enemies be at peace with us. And there does seem, even to the eye of sense and experience, as well as of faith, a likely and leading avenue towards such a consummation. If the great and urgent necessity of our present social condition be an elevation of character, and so of comfort, throughout the general population,—if it is becoming more palpable every day that this is the alone panacea for all our moral and all our political disorders,—if, in the utter fruitlessness of every other expedient, it be at last perceived, that by far the most effectual agency for humanizing an else ungovernable multitude into contentment, and loyalty, and peace, is the agency of well-taught schools and well-served churches,—who knows but that with these, which are our chief and chosen principles of action, we might, with the Divine countenance, effect a good so manifest and undeniable in the reclaimed families even of districts formerly the most outlandish and the most unpromising ; that the eyes even of the most inveterate may at length be opened, and their patriotism, if not their piety, incline them at the last to tolerate, nay to befriend, nay, positively to aid us.

But these, without a blessing from on high, are vain and earthly calculations ; and to make them good, there must be earnest, and united, and imploring prayer. In all our ways God must be acknowledged and inquired after ; and, unless by an answer of graciousness from the upper sanctuary, we can expect not sound or stable prosperity to any undertaking. Whether, then, individually and in secret, or in the assembled followships of the faithful, let the mighty engine of prayer be put into constant and general operation. We would cast our cause on the supplications of the people, and should esteem it the happiest presage of our coming enlargement, if we saw in the fervour and frequency of these, that God had indeed been pleased to pour a spirit of grace and of supplication over our land. “ Only prove me, saith the Lord of Hosts, and see whether I will not pour down a blessing upon you.” “ Ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence, and give Him no rest till He establish and till He make Jerusalem a praise on the earth.” “ Pray for the peace of Jerusalem ; they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions’ sakes, I will now say, peace be within thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek thy good.”

#### 4.—FROM DR. CUNNINGHAM'S SPEECH IN LONDON ON 28TH JUNE 1843.

*Delivered in Exeter Hall, on the occasion of a Deputation from the Free Church of Scotland—the Marquis of Braedalbane in the Chair.*

I may, just in two or three sentences recal to your recollection, without entering into detail or dwelling on *minutiae*, the position in which we are placed, and the substance of the principles for which we have contended and suffered—not in order to *defend* them, but that you may *know* what it is we have been maintaining, and in the hope that those who may cordially concur in the substance of these principles, may on that account be disposed more cordially to sympathise with us, and more seriously to aid us ; and in the hope also that those who, from a variety of sentiments, may not so cordially concur in all our views, may at least believe that in assert-

ing these principles, and following them out, as we have done,—even to renouncing the Established Church,—we have, to say the least of it, done nothing which should render us unworthy of the confidence of the Christian public. (Cheers.) You have already heard from my friend who preceded me, that this whole matter originated in a resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland,—that is to say, by the Evangelical party in that Church, in the first year that they gained the ascendancy in the General Assembly,—to the effect that they never would again thrust a minister upon a reclaiming congregation,—that is, they never would settle a man, by whomsoever he might be presented, in any parish, when the people of that parish came forward and unanimously declared that they would not have him to be their minister,—would not enter with him into the pastoral relation,—and would not subject themselves to him. I will not spend any time in recommending that principle. It is one which should, and no doubt will, commend itself to all who are free from any Popish desire to lord it over those who have any sense of the importance of those duties which Christ has imposed upon the members of His Church, and of the responsibility which he has laid upon them. On these grounds, we think we can fully vindicate those principles. In explaining it more clearly, I should state that we make a distinction between the missionary and pastoral aspects of the ministerial office. The ministry, in its missionary capacity, is directed to heathen men; and the proper co-relative to a minister, viewed as a missionary, is a company of men who do not owe subjection to Christ; and the proper co-relative to a minister, in a pastoral point of view, is a Christian company of faithful men, professing obedience to Christ, and admitted to all the ordinances which He has appointed. It is this we have in view when we say, no minister should be thrust upon a parish in opposition to the population of that parish,—that is, in opposition to the wishes of a Christian flock; and when we look at the nature of the pastoral relation, we cannot come to any other conclusion than that, to force a minister upon such a flock, is an act of tyranny and oppression. (Cheers.) I need not enlarge upon this point for the satisfaction of any of my friends amongst the Evangelical Dissenters, nor will I discuss the question at all; but I will content myself with reading one or two extracts on this subject, which perhaps will have some weight with my Episcopalian brethren, not in the way of argument, but as a testimony in the way of authority, and to show that there is nothing so unreasonable in maintaining the opinion of non-intrusion. (Cheers.) The first I shall read is from the venerable Hooker, who thus clearly lays down the great principle for which the Free Church of Scotland has been led to contend, in the 14th section of the 7th book of his Ecclesiastical Polity. It is here—“The power of order I may lawfully receive without asking leave of any multitude; but that power I cannot exercise upon any one certain people utterly against their wills; neither is there in the Church of England any man, by order of law, possessed with pastoral charge over any parish, but the people in effect do choose him thereunto,”—(this is rather extraordinary)—“for albeit they choose, not by giving every man personally his particular voice, yet can they not say that they have their pastors violently obtruded upon them, inasmuch as their ancient and original interest therein hath been by orderly means derived unto the patron who chooseth for them.” Hooker distinctly supports the great principles which we advocate. I will now just read a short extract from Bishop Bilson’s celebrated work on “the Perpetual Government of Christ’s Church.” It is this:—“I acknowledge each Church and people that have not by law, custom, or consent restrained themselves, stand free by God’s law to maintain, admit, and obey no man as their pastor without their liking; and so the people’s election by themselves or their rulers,

dependeth on the very first principles of human fellowships and assemblies; for which cause, though bishops, by God's law, have power to examine and ordain before any man be placed to take charge of souls, yet have they no power to impose a pastor upon any church against their wills, nor to force them to yield him obedience or maintenance without their liking." (Cheers.) Dr. Field in his book "of the Church," quotes these very words of Bilson, and adopts them as his own; and after quoting the usual proofs that the people in primitive times had the choice of their own ministers, he adds,— "By all which testimonies we see what interest anciently the people had in the choice of their bishops, and how careful good bishops were that they should have none thrust upon them against their wills,— that they should proceed to election with one accord if it might be, or otherwise, that such should be ordained as were desired by the greater part, and that all things might be done peaceably and without tumult." (Cheers.) This, I think, will convince our Episcopalian friends that we have some high authorities for the principles we maintain; and we must not therefore be regarded as violent and fanatical men, because we have adopted a resolution, in exact conformity with Bishop Bilson's views, not to intrude a minister upon a reclaiming congregation,—not to settle a man against the will of a Christian people; and because we continued to adhere to that resolution, notwithstanding the interposition of Civil Courts to require us to do it, and notwithstanding we have been driven forth from the Established Church of Scotland.

### 5.—ON THE GREAT MEETING FOR CHRISTIAN UNION,

JUNE 1843.

(From the Witness.)

The great meeting for the promotion of Christian union among all denominations of evangelical Christians, was held in Exeter Hall on Thursday week. We are sorry that from press of matter we cannot give a full account of this most important meeting. We expect, however, to be able to give an abstract of the speeches in our next. In the meantime, we subjoin the following interesting remarks on the subject from the London correspondent of the *Dundee Warter* :—

"I will venture to say that never in the history of this country—it may be doubted whether in the history of *any* country—was there held a *religious* meeting which, in point of importance, could be compared to it. The meeting was limited to *members* of Churches, and yet the number of applications for cards of admission was somewhere about 20,000. Had the meeting been open to all who have deeply at heart the objects which it has in view, it is supposed the number of applications for admission would have been 30,000 or 40,000. Exeter Hall can only accommodate, with any comfort 5,000 persons, and it was at first intended to limit the issue of tickets to that number; but the applicants were so importunate,—in many instances they would take no denial,—that 11,000 cards were given out. I do not see how it would be possible to cram that number of persons into Exeter Hall, but I have no doubt that at the least there were 8000 individuals present. I have been at most of the great meetings in the metropolis for the last ten years, but I never was present at one where the crowding was anything like that at the meeting of Thursday. The platform, on which there must have been 700 or 800 persons, was as crowded as the body of the building. On

the platform were ministers of *all* evangelical denominations, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Wesleyan Methodists, Independents, Baptists, Moravians, Lutherans, &c. &c. Among the gentlemen whose faces were familiar to me, and with several of whom I am on terms of intimacy, were Dr. Liefchild, Dr. Morison, Dr. Cox, Dr. Holloway, Dr. Alder, Dr. Harris, the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, the Rev. Thomas Mortimer, the Rev. Mr. Sherman, the Rev. Mr. Blackburne, the Rev. Mr. James, the Rev. Mr. Archer, the Rev. Mr. Redpath, the Rev. Mr. Hamilton, the Rev. Mr. Tidman, the Rev. Mr. Bunting, junior, &c. &c. It was a curious fact, and yet, all things considered, is it to be wondered at?—that, while all other evangelical denominations of Christians were represented at this great meeting, there was no ministerial representative of the Establishment of Scotland present,—though the three ministers in London still clinging to their connection with it, were all elected, as evangelical ministers, by the people, and are dependent on the voluntary contributions of their congregations for their support. Here I may mention, by way of parenthesis,—as showing the deep sympathy which the religious public of London feel towards the Non-Intrusionists,—that when the Rev. Mr. Sherman, the successor of Rowland Hill, announced the name of Mr. Hamilton as about to address the meeting, he did it in these words,—“Our reverend and dear friend, Mr. Hamilton, of the Scotch Free Presbyterian Church, Regent Square.” And though it had been agreed, at commencement of the proceedings, that there should be no plaudits or exhibitions of applause in any way, a buzz of satisfaction proceeded from every part of the vast assemblage as Mr. Sherman made the announcement. Allow me to add, that Mr. Hamilton’s speech was one of the best of the many able and excellent speeches of the day.”

## 6.—MISCELLANEOUS.

ON TRUE KNOWLEDGE.—As to the imputation of ignorance, one in your situation may be supposed to reply, “Ignorant of the Gospel! pardon me, my dear Sir; I have not been so long conversant with the best writers, and ablest divines, and read and thought, to so little purpose, as that I should now be unacquainted with the truths of Christianity. As I know these things, happy were I if I did them! Here, I acknowledge, I fail; but if my practice only corresponded with my knowledge, all would be well.” I am sure this is precisely what I should have said myself, a few years ago. Allow me to state, as a counterpart to this, a case which has frequently occurred to my thoughts. Suppose that in the last years of our Lord’s ministration, some old acquaintance should have enquired of one of the disciples, Philip for instance; “I wonder what sort of a person this Jesus of Nazareth is; pray, Philip, do you know him?” Philip would of course answer, “To be sure I do, no person knows him better; I have not been two days together out of his company these three years. Many a wonderful work have I seen him do, many a charming discourse have I heard from his mouth. O! neighbour, if you but knew him as well as I do!” Yet this was actually the man to whom our Lord found occasion to say—“Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?”—*Stewart’s Letters*.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.—Sojourn in this world as travellers through it to another and a better country. “For here we have no continuing city.”

This is God's command, "Arise ye, and depart, for this is not your rest." And remember, if we would be right travellers towards Zion above, we must have Christ in our hearts, heaven before our eyes, and the world under our feet. We must take God's spirit for our guide, his word for our rule, his glory for our end, his fear for our guard, his people for our companions, his promises for our cordials. Religion must be our business, prayer our delight, holiness our way, and heaven our home. Let Zion's travellers distinguish themselves from the men of this world. Let Christ always be precious to you, the word sweet, sin bitter, the world a wilderness, and death welcome. Let Christ's will be your will, his cause your concern, his success your joy, his cross your glory, his sufferings your meditation, his wounds your refuge, his righteousness your garment of salvation, "for glory and beauty." Let your hearts burn with love to Christ; let it be your delight to think of him, to hear of him, to read of him, to speak of him, your highest pleasure on earth to converse with him; And when you awake in heaven, you "shall be satisfied with his likeness" for you shall see him as he is, and be changed even unto his image—your eyes shall behold the King in his beauty—you shall see Him for yourself and not for another—and so shall ye be for ever with THE LORD.—(From an Old Author.)

#### IV.—INDIAN INTELLIGENCE

1. CALCUTTA.—A Pamphlet has just issued from the Calcutta Press, entitled "Explanatory Statement respecting the recent proceedings of the Missionaries of the Church of Scotland in Calcutta." It narrates the circumstances which have led to the disruption of the Kirk-Session of St. Andrew's Calcutta, and to the organization of a Church in connexion with the Free Church of Scotland, under the pastoral charge until permanent arrangements can be made, of one or more of the Missionaries. It is scarcely necessary, we presume, to acquaint our readers, that all Missionaries of the Church of Scotland, are necessarily ordained Ministers thereof. The Scottish Missionaries in Calcutta, having all of them separated from the Establishment, the following Resolutions embodying their reasons for so doing, were drawn up and transmitted home by them to the Reverend Conveners of the Foreign Missions of *both* Assemblies.

"In a matter which at home has been so thoroughly discussed, and in which all parties now so completely understand each other's views, as that which is at issue between the Church of Scotland presently established by law, and the Free Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, it may seem unnecessary for us to do more than state that we deem it incumbent on us, as Christian men and Christian ministers, to adhere to the latter on the same general and special grounds on which the latter felt constrained to secede from the former;—grounds, most clearly set forth as to their basis, in the Church's "Claim of Rights," prepared and adopted by the Assembly of 1842, and in their final issue, in the "Reasons of Protest and Separation" read by the Moderator at the Meeting of Assembly, 1843. But, in addition to this general statement, we deem it right, in a matter of so practical and transcendent importance, to record the following specific resolutions:—viz.

I. Resolved unanimously, to declare and record our solemn conviction, that in this and every other great question appertaining to morals and religion, our duty is,—primarily, to consult the dictates of conscience, and the clear intimations of Jehovah's infallible oracles;—and secondarily, in an ecclesiastical question such as the present, to refer to those standards of the Church, founded on the basis of God's word, which have been declared and subscribed to by its office-bearers as containing their own sincere interpretation of that supreme and ultimate standard;—leaving to Him, who can bring light out of darkness and order out of confusion, all the prospective results and consequences, however apparently disastrous these may seem to the short-sighted eye of sense.

II. That the Church of Scotland has uniformly in its ecclesiastical constitution, as derived directly from the New Testament and explicated in all its accredited standards, held forth and embodied as its fundamental, ecclesiastical principle, that the Lord Jesus Christ, not only as the co-equal and co-eternal Son of the Father, hath a universal kingdom of which all created beings are subjects, but also as Messiah—the Mediator and Redeemer, the eternal Word become incarnate, in order by His perfect obedience and sufferings unto death, to conquer sin, and death, and hell and the grave,—hath obtained, as the fruit and purchase of this mighty conquest, a kingdom concerning which He Himself testified, saying, "My kingdom is not of this world,"—a spiritual Kingdom or Church, of which, as redeemed by His own precious blood, and constituted by His express authority, He is the sole Head and Monarch, holding and exercising therein an exclusive Supremacy in all matters relating to doctrine, discipline and government,—the qualifications, functions and appointment of the office-bearers,—and the rights and liberties of its professing members.

III. That the contest, which for some time past has been carried on between the Ecclesiastical Establishment of Scotland on the one part, and the Civil Courts of the kingdom, whether subordinate or supreme, on the other part, has been one which directly and truly involved, in its fundamental principle and ultimate issues, the exclusive and supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ over His Church in all things spiritual, as well as the rights and duties of His ministers and people with respect to all those acts and privileges which are purely ecclesiastical, or which belong to the internal economy and management of His House and Temple in the world.

IV. That the present subsisting Church Establishment of Scotland, by the part which it has taken in the last General Assembly (not to refer to any former proceedings of its leading members) has, in our clear though sorrowful conviction, unduly and unscripturally submitted itself to the unconstitutional dictation of the merely Civil power, in regard to acts and privileges purely spiritual and ecclesiastical,—and that, to such an extent, as injuriously to compromise and sadly to obscure both those glorious points, the supreme Headship of Christ, and the spiritual freedom of His body the Church, and thus to leave it almost entirely at the disposal of the State or secular power in many of its most vital and distinctive actings as a constituted branch of the Church Universal.

V. That, on the other hand, the Free Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as represented in the acts, declarations and resolutions of its first Assembly, (without referring to the course previously pursued by its leading members,) does fully sustain and carry out the faith which we now hold, and have heretofore held, during the painful contest which has now come to a close, on those grand and important articles already referred to, viz. the royal prerogatives of Christ's crown and covenant, and the dear-bought privileges of His Church, which may never be yielded up—however they may be resisted or gainsayed—in any circumstances, without sin,—without a virtual renunciation of the Great Head, and an actual surrender of the birthright of His people.

VI. That being now, in the providence of God, and without any overt act or previous proceeding on our part, called on to make choice between those two bodies, whose spiritual and ecclesiastical claims are now submitted to our election, we feel, in deep and unfeigned sorrow, that we cannot by acceptance of jurisdiction, representation, or commission of ministry, remain incorporated with the present Established Church; although, as to the scriptural principle and duty of a national recognition and establishment of Christianity, our sentiments are



altogether unchanged :—but must declare, as we hereby do, our deliberate purpose of adherence to the Free Protestant Presbyterian Church, as being, according to our understanding of the word of God, more purely a Church of Christ; and also as being, according to our interpretation of the Books of Discipline, the Confession of Faith, and other ratified Standards, together with the Act of Security and the Treaty of Union, more truly the original Church of Scotland, in all that is essentially spiritual and ecclesiastical, than the present subsisting Establishment.

VII. That we cannot honestly or conscientiously refrain from coming to this practical conclusion, on the ground that at present we are not, in this land, practically affected by the specific modes of interference with the supreme Headship of Christ, and the rights and liberties of His ministers and people, which have led so unhappily to the disruption of the Church at home;—since, as members and office-bearers in the Church, ours is not a merely co-operative union (such as may exist between different Christian communities) but an essentially incorporative union, so that we are bound not only by the general obligations of Church-membership, but also, and more especially, by our ordination vows, to uphold in their integrity the whole of her avowed Doctrines, Discipline and Government, or views and principles of Ecclesiastical Polity generally :—and hence, if, in our deliberate judgment there be a departure on the part of the Established Church from any of the fundamental principles of God's word, and her own original standards, or any surrender, at the instigation of earthly Potentates, of the prerogatives of Zion's King, or the vital interests of Zion's cause and Scotland's covenanted Reformation, we have no alternative, in consistency and honor, but to protest, come out, and be separate.

VIII. That, while we most deeply regret the painful circumstances which led to the disruption of the Established Church, and which have imposed on us the necessity of making an election, and of emitting this declaration of our decision in the all-important matter before us; and while we retain strong and warm feelings of personal attachment and esteem towards not a few with whom we were officially and in many other ways connected, but from whom we must now be ecclesiastically separated;—we yet further feel that the crisis is one of a character altogether paramount and overwhelming, from which we cannot and dare not shrink; that the grand central principle involved in it, as an article of faith, is affected neither by lapse of time nor distance of place, nor difference of outward or worldly circumstances; and that Christ's Missions, which carry forward His embassy and great commission to proclaim the gospel to every creature, will best prosper when they stand most nearly related, in their agency at home and abroad, to a clear conscience, a consistent practice, and a Church in which the Head is most exalted, the body most pure, the members most free, and the entire energies of the regenerate nature most unshackled."

It is right also to quote—and we do so without comment—the correspondence which passed between the Missionaries who were members of the St. Andrew's Kirk-Session, and the Reverend Moderator—explanatory of the separation in that body.

TO THE REV. DR. CHARLES,

*Moderator of the Session of St. Andrew's Kirk.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

We the undersigned, members of the Kirk-Session of St. Andrew's Church respectfully request that you be pleased, at your earliest convenience, to call a Meeting of Session for the purpose of considering how, or to what extent, the recent disruption in the Established Church of Scotland may affect us, as a subordinate Court of the same, formed and constituted in virtue of the Ecclesiastical Charter bearing date Edinburgh, 30th May, 1814.

We remain, yours very truly,

ALEXANDER DUFF.

W. S. MACKAY.

DAVID EWART.

August 1st, 1843.

TO THE REV. DR. DUFF, THE REV. W. S. MACKAY, AND THE REV. D. EWART,  
*Members of the Kirk-Session of St. Andrew's Church.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I have this afternoon had the honor to receive your letter, under date the 1st instant, in which you, as members of the Kirk-Session of St. Andrew's Church, respectfully request me to call a Meeting of Session at my earliest convenience, "for the purpose of considering how or to what extent the recent disruption of the Established Church of Scotland may affect us, as a subordinate Court of the same, formed and constituted in virtue of the Ecclesiastical Charter bearing date Edinburgh, 30th May, 1814."

2. I beg with equal respect to intimate that I decline compliance with your request, because I do not see the shadow of a ground for convening a Meeting of the Kirk-Session for the purpose indicated by you, and more particularly because I consider such a Meeting to be, as far as you are concerned, wholly unnecessary, as I know that, at a Meeting held at the Institution on the 19th ultimo, you individually and collectively resolved to give in your formal adhesion to the body of Seceders from the Established Church of Scotland, and by necessary consequence to cease to be office-bearers in the said Established Church.

I have the honor to be,

Rev. and dear Sirs,

Your obedient Servant,

JAMES CHARLES,

Calcutta, August 2d, 1843.

*Moderator of the Kirk-Session.*

TO THE REV. DR. CHARLES,

*Moderator of the Session of St. Andrew's Kirk, Calcutta.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 2nd instant, in which you refuse to summon a Meeting of Session at our request for the following reasons:—

*First.* Because you "do not see the shadow of a ground for convening a Meeting of the Kirk-Session for the purpose indicated," by us.

*Second.* Because you "consider such a meeting to be, as far as we are concerned, wholly unnecessary, as you know, that, at a Meeting held at the Institution on the 19th ultimo,\* we individually and collectively resolved to give our formal adhesion to the body of Seceders from the Established Church of Scotland, and by necessary consequence to cease to be office-bearers in the said Established Church."

1. We cannot admit that it is unnecessary to consider a question, which has convulsed our national Church, and rent it into two bodies, to one or other of which every one of its judicatories must practically adhere; and of which judicatories, by special act of the General Assembly, dated Edinburgh, May 1814, the Session of St. Andrew's Kirk, Calcutta, is undeniably one.

2. In regard to what reports of our acts and intentions, in another and distinct Ecclesiastical relationship, you, in your private capacity, may have gathered from private and unofficial information, we cannot allow your right to notice these officially in any other way than by calling a Meeting of Session, to inquire into their truth and proceed thereon, according to the rules of the Church.

3. But apart altogether from the reasons of your refusal, we protest against that refusal itself, inasmuch as it is plainly and directly opposed to the laws, constitution and practice of the Church of Scotland.

From all this it is quite evident, that,—in the extraordinary circumstances, in which we find ourselves now placed, constituting as we do, with the exception of

\* We held no such meeting on the 19th ultimo.

yourself, the whole of the Session of St. Andrew's Kirk, at present in Calcutta, and being refused the constitutional privilege of a regular Meeting.—we have no alternative but to demit, as we hereby do, our status as Ruling Elders, in the said Session and congregation of St. Andrew's Kirk. And this we do, on these two specific grounds, either of which would have operated without the other, but which are now combined :—

1. That you have most distinctly, in your official character, denied us our very first and most elementary right, as members of Session, the opportunity, in an extraordinary emergency like the present, of considering, discussing, reasoning and voting, relative to matters deeply affecting our rights and privileges as office-bearers, as well as the vital religious interests of the congregation.

2. Because, by this very act of refusal, taken in conjunction with the ostensible reasons, and legitimate inferences therefrom, you virtually and plainly, in our judgment, declare your purpose, as Moderator of Session, to remain as you now are,—that is,—in connection with, and under the jurisdiction of, the Residuary Church Establishment of Scotland, and, therefore, ecclesiastically identified with principles and procedure, with which we feel that we can maintain no corporate communion.

In conclusion, seeing that we have also heretofore stood ecclesiastically related to the congregation, of which you are the senior minister, we reserve to ourselves the right of making known to it, these our resolutions, with their reasons, in such way as may appear to us most proper.

We write these things firmly yet respectfully, and now leave you, with feelings of deep regret, not only on account of the peculiar manner in which we have been compelled thus to withdraw, but also, and more particularly, on account of the position which you seem to have taken up, as to the present duty of the Church.

We have the honor to be,

Rev'd. and dear Sir,

Your obedient Servants,

ALEXANDER DUFF.

W. S. MACKAY.

DAVID EWART.

August 5th, 1843.

---

TO THE REV. DR. DUFF, THE REV. W.S. MACKAY, THE REV. DAVID EWART.

REV. AND DEAR SIRS,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your joint letter of the 5th instant, in which you acquaint me that you demit your status as Ruling Elders in the Session and congregation of St. Andrew's Church.

I content myself with this simple acknowledgment,—which the pressure of my official engagements has prevented me from making at an earlier period, as no useful purpose would in my judgment be served by reviewing the specific reasons, which you have thought proper to assign for taking this step.

With every proper sentiment of respect, I have the honor to be,

Rev. and dear Sirs,

Your obedient Servant,

JAMES CHARLES.

Calcutta, August 8th, 1843.

Moderator of the Kirk-Session.

At a General Meeting of Adherents to the Free Church, which took place on the 24th August, the following Resolutions were passed unanimously :—

" I. That all those gentlemen present, who may now subscribe themselves " Adherents of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland," do form themselves

into a COMMITTEE, under the name of "THE GENERAL PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE" of the adherents of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, in Calcutta," with power to add to their number, from the future adherents to the same.

II. That this General Committee, now formed, do embrace this present and earliest opportunity of expressing their entire and heartfelt concurrence in the measures which were temporarily adopted, for the ministration of the ordinances of God amongst them, by the former Provisional Committee—and their purpose, until more definite arrangements can be made, and a Church organized, of still committing to them, in their capacity of ordained Ministers and Elders of the Free Church of Scotland, to minister to their spiritual wants, and to suggest what may be further for their spiritual edification.

III. That there be now appointed, by this General Committee of adherents, a SPECIAL SUB-COMMITTEE for executive purposes, and which shall report from time to time, to the General Committee—to consist of the members of the former Provisional Committee, and others from the body of adherents to be now named, with Secretaries and a Treasurer—as follows:—

The Rev. Dr. Duff, W. S. Mackay, D. Ewart, J. Macdonald, T. Smith;—Simon Nicolson, Esq., James Calder Stewart, Esq., A. B. Mackintosh, Esq., R. J. Rose, Esq., D. Maccallum, Esq., Wm. Nichol, Esq., Malcolm Macleod, Esq.—The Rev. J. Macdonald, and J. C. Stewart, Esq., to be Joint-Secretaries, and Mr. Stewart to be also Treasurer.

IV. That, in our present circumstances, it is evidently necessary, that, as a congregation of adherents, however small in number, we be provided with a suitable and permanent place of worship, for our own special use; and that, therefore, the Provisional Sub-Committee be authorized and empowered to take such preparatory steps, as may to them seem best, for the attainment of this end, and to report thereon, at a future meeting of the General Committee.

V. That, as it is desirable that some public exposition of the principles and grounds of separation from the established Church of Scotland, and of adherence to the Free Church of Scotland, should be given, the Senior Missionary, the Rev. Dr. Duff, be requested to undertake this important duty, at such time and place as may be found most convenient."

---

A subscription set on foot towards a fund for the erection of a place of worship in Calcutta, has already been raised on the spot, and with scarcely an effort, to nearly ten thousand Rupees as Donations, exclusive of monthly contributions either actually received or awaiting the call for them. Both those subscription-tables will doubtless receive further accessions, when they are known throughout the Upper Provinces and other places at a distance.

2. MADRAS AND BOMBAY.—At those Presidencies all the ordained Ministers of the Church of Scotland, employed as Missionaries, have recognized the same sad but imperative obligation to quit the Establishment, as have their Brethren in Calcutta; the entire body of Scottish Missionaries in India, without a single exception, thus nobly justifying the confident assurance which was openly expressed in the Free Assembly at home, as to the course, which conscience and duty would lead them one and all to pursue at this solemn crisis. In Bombay a subscription for the building and endowing of a Church, has most prosperously commenced; and intelligence of the same nature may be looked for from Madras presently.

We cannot close these brief and imperfect notices of what has passed in India, in connection with those momentous events at home, without a fervent acknowledgment of the goodness of God, in granting such unanimity and fidelity to all those Missionaries of His Truth in this land, who were called upon to select a side in this great controversy ; and in bestowing so largely of the like spirit on others :—so that it is not individuals, but flocks, that are now seen witnessing even here, for those principles which have endured such a conflict in the land of our fathers. Nor can we omit remarking also with gratitude to God, the spirit of Christian love and sympathy in which the religious Press of India has generally commented on these things. We hope, nay, we are perfectly assured, that these and the other great events in Providence which we see now evolving in the earth, are all tending to create a nearer and closer Brotherhood of heart among Evangelical Christians of whatever denomination. The present occasion itself bears ample testimony to the correctness of this opinion. That glorious Meeting “For Christian Union,” which took place at Exeter Hall on the 3rd of June last, and the Bicentenary Commemoration of the Westminster Confession, of which we shall probably hear in a few weeks more—speak loudly to the same effect. The age is full of evidence to the fact that Sectarian distinctions among evangelical Christians, must now be merged, as altogether secondary things, in the common necessity of preparation for a united war—in defence of those principles of Religious Truth which all alike acknowledge to be vital and fundamental—a war likely to prove more arduous than has yet been fought between those ancient Powers which divide the allegiance of our apostate race. Happy all they, who, with such a conflict in view—already indeed begun—remain loyal to the Captain of their Salvation ! They may rally to the field, like different regiments in a well-ordered army, displaying distinctive appointments and peculiar blazons—and cheering themselves for the fight by many personal associations which those various symbols endear to their remembrance. But all form *one* mighty host,—animated by *one* Spirit, of faith and hope and love—assembled for *one* great conflict—and led on by *one* Invincible Leader—“The Lord their God is with them, and the shout of A KING is among them !”

---

# THE FREE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. I.]      SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1843.      [No. 2.

## I.—A GLANCE AT THE PAST.

From the period of the “Revolution” Settlement of the National Church of Scotland, down to the year 1834, the party known by the name of “Moderate,” has always been in possession of great influence, and, during the last eighty years or more, of almost undisputed ascendancy in the Supreme Ecclesiastical Courts—exercising its power from time to time with more or less rigor, according as political circumstances, or those checks in favor of religious freedom, which Presbyterianism as a system happily provides, permitted. The period in which “Moderateism” prevailed with most absolute sway, was during the life of the distinguished historian Robertson. “In 1763, from being principal prompter and assistant in the management, Dr. Robertson became the sole manager, almost the dictator of the Scottish Church.” His eminent literary talents, and the tact of his ecclesiastical policy, which combined something of the school of Loyola with that of Macchiavel,\* for nearly twenty years, had the effect of too generally obscuring from view the real state of degradation into which the once vigorous and evangelical Church of Scotland had now fallen:—little else than a mere assemblage of clerical pensioners on the state, the Church was (as a Church) all but spiritually dead,—was, as a Body, become deplorably inefficient for the discharge of its great and solemn duties. We say *as a Body*—and *as a Church*: for we know perfectly well, and should never be guilty of forgetting, that even at this darkest period in the whole history of the Scottish Church since its Reformation, God had not left himself without witnesses; individual pastors here and there, broke the bread

\* If this reflection appear too harsh, let the reader judge for himself, by consulting “The Life and Times of Principal Robertson”—an admirable ecclesiastical memoir which first appeared as a series of articles in the pages of the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor* in 1840, and has since, we believe, in consequence of the attention it attracted, been published separately.

of life to a few faithful flocks. But all contemporary records confirm the assertion, that our national Church, as such, was at this period in a state of all but spiritual death;\* and this need not be wondered at, when the absolute and universally worshipped leader of its councils for a long course of years, was the man of whom even the pious and gentle-spoken Wilberforce went out of his way to write as follows :—

“ It has also been a melancholy prognostic of the state to which we are progressive, that many of the most eminent *literati* of modern times have been professed unbelievers; and that others of them have discovered such lukewarmness in the cause of Christ, as to treat with especial good will, and attention, and respect, those men, who, by their avowed publications, were openly assailing, or insidiously undermining, the very foundations of the Christian's hope; considering themselves as more closely united to them by literature, than severed from them by the widest religious differences. It is with pain that the author finds himself compelled to place so great a writer as Dr. Robertson in this class. But to say nothing of his phlegmatic account of the Reformation (a subject which we should have thought likely to excite, in any one who united the character of a Christian divine with that of a historian, some warmth of pious gratitude for the good providence of God); to pass over, also, the ambiguity in which he leaves his readers as to his opinion of the authenticity of the Mosaic chronology, in his *Disquisitions on the Trade of India*; his *Letters to Mr. Gibbon*, lately published, cannot but excite emotions of regret and shame in every sincere Christian.”—*Practical View of Christianity*, p. 304. *Fifth Edition*.

As for the privileges of the Christian people of the land, under this withering reign of Moderateism—suffice it to say, that the violent settlements of Ministers against the wishes of the people, by Military force, and by the strong arm of Civil Power, were so common throughout the country, that the “*Riding Commissions*” of the Assembly, as they were called, which were instituted to give a RELIGIOUS SANCTION (!) to those atrocities, almost ceased to shock when told of. Deserted parish churches were every where seen. The people, robbed of their first privilege as Members of a Christian Church—a voice in the nomination of their own spiritual guides—went over in numbers as they had opportunity, to Presbyterian Dissenting Congregations; and where this opportunity did not offer—there was *no* remedy for their wrong—they *must* take the stones offered them for bread—there was no man to care for their souls! Those generations have now passed away; at whose hands their blood will be required, is an awful question which we have no right to attempt to answer!

But towards the close of last century, when God, who is rich in mercy, had been pleased to revisit the faithless churches of our native Land, by raising up and wondrously blessing the labors of a succes-

\* “That Church,” says a distinguished living writer, regarding this period—“must have been sunk indeed, which in more than one instance, protected its ministers in their status as clergymen, until the Civil Courts interfered and condemned them as felons! There doubtless have been many Churches that have sunk lower in *positive crime*; but no Church since the Reformation had ever sunk lower in *religious feeling*. Never was there a Church in which the salient principle, whether a living evangelism, or an energetic superstition, had become more utterly effete.” Such was the golden age of Moderateism; and the Moderates of 1843, do yet speak of the days of Robertson, and Blair, and Home, as the brightest in our Church history! They be witnesses against themselves that they are the true descendants of those whose party name they bear, and whose principles they approve, and most vigorously practise.

sion of pious ministers in many places—the evangelical party in the Church of Scotland, naturally began to increase in power and numbers, and Moderateism began in the same proportion to wane. For years now, the former continued to constitute a large and an advancing minority—so that in course of time, by their zeal and energy, backed by the strong religious feelings of a now numerous population awakening more and more to a sense of vast duties and responsibilities long neglected, this section of the Established Church was actually able occasionally to quench opposition, and even to compel many of the moderate party to co-operate with them, for very shame, in many of their evangelizing projects. Thus the rising tide of true religious principle and feeling throughout the land, had already—*before the Evangelical party attained a numerical majority in the assembly*—undermined much of that opposition, which had formerly been raised with such vehemence by the Moderates, against many projected works of faith and labors of love, such as are now-a-days admitted on all hands to be the indispensable proofs of the sincerity of a religious profession whether in a Church, or in individuals. No ultra-moderate of “the old school” of Principal Robertson, would have DARED in 1835, to *denounce Missionary enterprizes* as was done openly in the Assembly of 1795 ! The spirit of Moderateism in short was tamed, against its nature, by the advancing piety of the nation.

At length in 1834, the Evangelical party obtained a working majority in the General Assembly, and retained it until 1843, when the two parties—so long divided in mind and in principle—separated for ever into two Communions.

Let us now then take a very cursory view of what the Established Church of Scotland did, in discharge of her duties *as a Church of Christ*, during those eight or nine years in which she was governed by that evangelical party which has now been forced to quit her pale.

“The tree is known by its fruits.” A few authentic facts are often worth a hundred arguments. “Men do not gather grapes from thorns, nor figs from thistles.”

The following statements are condensed from a Statistical View published about the beginning of 1842 in Glasgow, by the Revd. J. G. Lorimer, late of St. David's Parish in that city,—an able and excellent divine whose learning and talents have done much service to the Church, and whose statements, on this occasion, it is right to mention, are founded in every material point, on official records.

1. It will be admitted that one of the very first duties of a Christian Church, is her EXTENSION ; i. e. the duty of encroaching more and more, as she has opportunity, on the surrounding regions of vice and ignorance—the duty of being instant in season and out of season in extending the application of all the appointed means and ordinances of grace to the relief of the spiritual wants of every immortal soul within her appointed sphere of action. What else, it may almost be asked, does a Church exist for at all, if not for this ? ●

It is notorious that though the extension of the Church, in other words, the propagation of Christianity at home, be as binding as the



law of self-preservation—yet the moderate party not only did nothing to promote, but actually discouraged Church extension. Witness the vexatious obstacles to the erection of Chapels of Ease for half a century—the union, instead of the disjunction of large parishes, in the face of the rapid progress of the population ; (no less than sixteen parish churches were suppressed in the Synod and county of Aberdeen) ; and as the general result, the wide-spread moral and religious destitution of immense districts of the Highlands and Islands and Lowlands, after seventy years of the ascendancy of Moderateism. The Church extension in which they were most successful was the extension of Dissent from the Establishment. *The existence of from 400 to 500 congregations in Scotland, dissenting from the Church, not in doctrine or discipline or government, as in England, but while in all these respects at one with the Church,—is a plain indication of VIOLENT separation.* The general encrease of the population will by no means fully account for the encrease of Presbyterian Dissent. The large proportion of Dissenters in quiet parishes, where there is no want of church accommodation, proclaims that it must have been owing to a negligent and unpopular, if not a violent policy in the Church. The “*New Statistical Account of Scotland*” contains melancholy evidence of this ; see not a few of the rural parishes of Peebles, Selkirk, Roxburg, Wigton, in which it is not uncommon to find a fourth, a third, and in some cases well nigh a half of the families ranged on the side of Dissent. Thus the population of Selkirkshire is divided into 688 Church Establishment families, and 455 Dissenting Presbyterian. The only exception to this sad history of Moderateism was the erection, in 1818, of 42 Parliamentary churches,—but this was the doing not of the Moderate party *as a party*, but of the State, and much more even of this, it is believed, might have been accomplished, had it not been for their jealousy of popular influence.

What a contrast the spirit and conduct of the Church under Evangelical rule ! True to the spirit and practice of their fathers—no sooner did they rise into the ascendancy in 1834, than they set on foot the Church extension scheme—and succeeded, in seven brief years, in collecting £305,747, for the erection of upwards of 200 churches, thus bringing the gospel of salvation to the doors of 160,000 people formerly neglected, besides creating kirk-sessions, Sabbath and Week-day schools, and other instruments of permanent good. Had the Moderate party loved Church extension, what hindered them to have done the same during their protracted reign ?

2. Next to the preservation and extension of a Christian church, nothing is more important than the purity of its DISCIPLINE in regard to all its members—particularly its office-bearers. But what was the state of matters in this respect under the reign of Moderateism ? Was not the difficulty of getting rid of an immoral minister or school-master almost proverbial ? This sad truth will be sufficiently apparent on a mere reference to the Records of the Church. During the last twenty years of the reign of Moderateism (a favourable period, when under the influence of public opinion some improvement might

have been expected), there was *no case of the deposition of a single minister for immorality*, though there were too many cases calling loudly for such discipline, (as a quotation above sufficiently proves), and some of which have been disposed of by their successors. Look on the other hand at the vigorous manner in which the Evangelical Church took up the cases of Campbell, Wright, Brewster and others. Would Puseyism have been tolerated in the Church of Scotland under evangelical sway for ten years? Not for a single day! But Moderateism, as we see shall presently, tolerated—nay (dreadful to relate) honored—even infidelity.

In the General Assembly of 1841, a minister who had been allowed to diffuse heresy for many years, under the lax rule of Moderateism, was deposed by the Church, and another fled for shelter from the censures of the Church to the Court of Session, and that in so serious a case as theft!

3. The literary and religious EDUCATION of the young, through Sabbath and Week-day schools, is one of the leading concerns of the Church of Christ. Even here Moderateism in the Church has little of which to boast. It appears, from the evidence laid, before the Parliamentary Committee on the Sabbath, that, so lately as 1799, there was only *one parochial school in the twelve parishes of Shetland, and only three in the eighteen parishes of Orkney!* The Moderates, as a party, made no efforts, by societies or otherwise, to supply this deficiency, and far less the educational wants of the country generally. Sabbath schools, too, met with little encouragement at their hands. A leading Moderate minister signalised himself by his opposition to them. The late Principal Baird indeed, who was a member of the Moderate party, was indefatigable in his educational labours, and deserves all possible commendation; but even in his days there were only 152 parochial collections—in 1842 there were 641. The Highlands and Islands, where Moderateism is most prevalent, are also the quarters where the educational wants of the country are most extensive and crying; and the Parliamentary returns of grants to Scotland for educational purposes of late years, are confirmatory of the same views. The Lords of the Treasury issue grants *proportionally to the sum previously raised by the friends of education who apply for public aid.* The printed return stretches over five years, to 1838 inclusive, and it appears that only *five* Moderate ministers applied and received grants to the amount of £1,880. In addition to the actual grants, there are cases where the Lords of the Treasury make promises of assistance when particular conditions are complied with. There are but *three* such promises to the Moderate party, amounting in all to £154. How different the state of matters with the Evangelical party! They made *sixty* applications for aid, of which number thirty-eight have obtained actual grants to the large amount of £14,594. 5s. The remainder (twenty-two) received promises to the extent of £6,465. The Evangelical party may thus be said to have absorbed £21,059 of the £28,241 which at the time of the return had been granted or promised by the Government,—the rest of the sum not already

accounted for, being granted or promised to different individuals associated into societies. There are also grants to three Episcopal ministers, and one to a Dissenting minister. How do these facts speak to the zeal and liberality of this party in the cause of education ! *It must never be forgotten that before they could have obtained the £21,000 they must have raised as much, generally much more, from their own resources.* Their occupying the towns to so large an extent will not explain the facts. *Many* of the grants are to country parishes. But take an instance even in towns. A few years before the parliamentary grants were made, four parishes in Glasgow expended £7,600 in school building ; and nine parishes, all under Evangelical Ministers, while receiving £3,605 of the grant, expended £11,260 from their own resources,—making together nearly £19,000 of private contributions.

4. Another test of the character of a Christian church is its **Missionary Spirit**. No duty is more binding or more generally acknowledged at the present day, than that of communicating to Jew and Gentile the knowledge of the Gospel. Indeed the motive here is less apt to be influenced by secular considerations—hence the test is the more satisfactory. But is it not notorious that the Moderates as a party have been most indifferent to Christian missions ? Before the cause was taken up by the Church, they stood aloof, while their evangelical brethren were associated in Missionary Societies. The latter could not do otherwise when there were no missionary schemes in the Establishment. When the obligations of missionary labour were brought before the General Assembly in 1796, the object was expressly discountenanced ; and a minister who made the leading speech on the Moderate side—a speech full of ignorance and false principle—instead of being censured, was a few years afterwards raised to the honour of filling the Moderator's chair, plainly showing how general was the anti-missionary spirit of the then rulers of the Church.\* Though an improvement has happily taken place since the evangelical party became predominant, how defective are still the doings of Moderateism ? Taking the vote on the Duke of Argyle's bill in the General Assembly of 1811 as a pretty fair test of the numbers then adhering to the views of both parties in the Church, how do the parties so estimated stand in regard to collections for the Five Schemes of the Church ? It appears from the official statements of parochial collections in 1840, the last then published, that out of sixty-three ministers, the whole number voting against the bill, not less than twenty-one, **ONE-THIRD OF THE MODERATE VOTERS DID NOT MAKE A SINGLE CONTRIBUTION FOR ANY OF THE SCHEMES**, while of the evangelical party, out of one hundred and eleven ministers, the whole number voting, only sixteen

\* This anti-missionary "Moderate" Minister of the Everlasting Gospel of the grace of God—(let his name rest in the shade)—is said to have expressed himself in these awful words on this occasion :—"The Gospel is a principle suited to render savages only more immoral and barbarous than they naturally are." The Moderate Assembly of the Church of Scotland ratified the dictum, and elevated the utterer of it soon afterwards to the presidency of the Church !

failed in making collections ; in other words, only *one-seventh* of the majority failed. The whole amount for all the Schemes obtained by the collections of the minority (deducting the case of one gentleman who spoke *for* the bill, though he usually supported the minority) was only £293—not the support of a single missionary to the heathen !—while the whole sum obtained by the Evangelical majority, including the Moderator, in the same way, was about £2,600 ; in other words, the one party did nearly *NINE TIMES* as much as the other. Had the majority raised money for Christian objects in the same proportion with the minority, they should have contributed less than £600. Instead of this, they raised £2,600. “What do these facts” says Mr. Lorimer, “show if not that the evangelical party hold the towns and the leading places of influence ; that the religious portion of the towns are with them in their present struggle, however much the irreligious may be opposed and misrepresent them ; that they possess much more of a missionary spirit ; that the prospects of the missionary undertakings of the Church,—so interesting in themselves and so manifestly blessed of God, would be melancholy indeed if entrusted to the hands of Moderateism ? These results are not accidental. \* Similar investigations, for several years past, in a similar way, bring out pretty nearly the same conclusions.” The amazing progress too, of the Schemes, in number and pecuniary resources—since the evangelical ascendancy, might also be appealed to. In the last Moderate year, i.e. 1833, there were but two schemes, revenue £4,858—in 1842 five, and the sum £22,000. In 1843, the amount collected is £26,000.

5. The last point of comparison between the two parties to which the attention of the reader is solicited, is the point of *UNION AMONG CHRISTIAN CHURCHES*. Nothing has been a greater stumblingblock to the world than separation among the professed disciples of Christ holding the same truths. Nor is any duty more imperative than to heal such divisions. Now what has been the spirit of the Moderate party as compared with that of their brethren ? Besides creating by their unpopular and violent policy,\* a mass of dissent, they in 1799 passed an act, rendering it unlawful for any minister of the Church to admit to his pulpit the minister of any other church, however unexceptionable ; and one of the first things the Residuary Assembly of 1843, has done, is to restore this odious act ! Under their rule, the separation of Christian churches became complete. But no sooner did the government of the Church pass into Evangelical hands, than there were delightful unions established between the Church of Scotland, and one of the sections of the Secession Church in Scotland, the Presbyterian Church in England, the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and a section of orthodox Presbyterians in Colonies. A friendly correspondence also was placed in course of being opened up between the Church of Scotland and the Protestant Churches of the Continent. The Free Church has had this hope fully realized now—and expanding views of the same delightful nature open on her, on every hand. No less than thirty Presbyterian con-

gregations in consequence of the principles for which she is now contending, have, after the separation of several ages, joined her pale.

Our readers will have some little idea from this picture, brief and meagre as the outline is, of the Christian doings of the Church of Scotland under her few years of evangelical sway from 1834 to 1842 ; although these years too were years of a most anxious and desperate struggle for her very existence as an establishment—a struggle, one would have thought, enough to have engrossed all her time and energies. In May 1842, the last General Assembly in which the influence of that party was to prevail—met ; and the following is a succinct analysis, a tabular Index of the actual proceedings of that never-to-be-forgotten Assembly, as published in the *Presbyterian Review* for the July following, with a few introductory sentences which appear worthy of quotation also :—

“ No General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has ever met in circumstances of profounder solemnity, or with prospects more overclouded. Enemies determined and ferocious ; treacherous and heartless defection in the ranks of the professed upholders of the truth ; civil power glorying in its sacrilegious usurpation of spiritual authority, and eagerly rushing on to fresh invasions of ecclesiastical order ; the Executive of the State in league with her enemies, and proclaiming its resolution to enforce what it calls existing law against her to the uttermost ! No outlook could well be gloomier—no circumstances more solemn.

Yet never, perhaps, was any Assembly ushered in with more of external pageantry and brilliance. Whether to dazzle or to over-awe is a question ; still such was the fact. The world seems to have summoned all its pomp to grace the train of the representative of royalty. It was a bright, though vain parade of splendour. And had the church no concern in it at all ? None in one sense, and yet something in another. None, in so far as the mere glitter was concerned, yet much, in so far as it was a summoning of the nation's attention to the deliberations that were to follow. It seemed as if the world were acting as the church's herald, to call men's eyes and ears to the noble position which was about to be occupied, and the glorious testimony which was to be lifted up, by a church, which of all the standard-bearers of the Reformation, had ever borne the fullest, clearest testimony to Christ's gospel and Christ's government, and whose ancient banner, long soiled and hidden, was now again to be uplifted and unfolded, for the gaze, the admiration, the instruction, not of Scotland, nor of Europe, but of the world ! Let us briefly turn up THE TESTIMONY which this General Assembly has borne, that both friends and enemies may consider it—that the churches of Christ throughout the earth may ponder it. When, in any age or country, has a Testimony so bold, so ample, so rich, so manifold, been lifted up by a church of Christ, as, during these ten short days, has been done by the Church of Scotland, in circumstances of no ordinary difficulty and peril ? It is not easy to give a correct classification of the various points to which she has borne witness ; we merely throw hastily together the following heads, as a summary or index of the proceedings which follow. It may either be regarded as a brief table of contents, or as an analysis of the different principles set forth in the acts, proceedings, and declarations of the General Assembly of 1842.

I. Christ the Head of his body the Church—None may interfere between the head and the members.—Christ the only King and Lawgiver of his Church.—No appeal in matters spiritual or ecclesiastical to any civil tribunal upon earth.—All encroachment upon this jurisdiction to be protested against and resisted to the uttermost.—No possibility of compromise or concession on this point. (See Claim of Rights, Protests against the Civil Interdicts, Refusals to go into Court upon Spiritual Matters, Different Decisions pronounced in the face of Civil Interdicts.)

II. Laws of Christ's Church.—These distinct from and beyond the control of civil laws.—No human judge may abrogate, alter, or interfere with them.—Not founded upon expediency, but on the word of God.—By these laws all courts ecclesiastical entirely regulated.—Erastianism condemned. (See Cases of Discipline—Cambusnethan—Stranraer.)

III. Rights of Christ's people.—Right of a free voice in the choice of their pastors. (Anti-patronage Act.)—Right of free consent in the knitting of the pastoral bond, (Act regarding Calls).—Right of dissent from the intrusion of unacceptable pastors. (Non-intrusion).—Right of deliverance from pastors that have been already thrust upon them, (Culsamond, Glass).—These rights not to be interfered with or usurped by patron, civil courts, or presbytery. (See Anti-patronage, Strathbogie, and condemnation of the *Liberum Arbitrium*.)

IV. The Ministry.—(1.) Preparation for.—The Souls of students, as well as their understandings, to be watched over by the Church, so that their piety as well as their learning may be provided for. (See the first Saturday's proceedings.)—(2.) Probation for. Care to be had, not merely in the matter of license, but after license, to see that during the time when they are called to exercise and prove their gifts for the ministry, they be provided with special fields of labour, both for their own profit and for the cultivation of the waste places of the land. (See Scheme for Employment of Probationers.) 3. Entrance on.—Their motives must be holy, not carnal and worldly; taking the oversight of the flock; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; not from love to the hire, but from love to souls. (See cases of Fala, Ladykirk, Kettle.) 4. Appointment to the case of a particular flock.—This, the office of the Head of the Church,—"I will give them pastors after mine own heart;" the mind of the Head to be ascertained, through the free voice of the members, not through the Patron or Presbyteries; this voice not a more negative one, saying who is unsuitable, but a direct and positive one, saying who is suitable. (See cases referred to in No. III.) 5. Ordination.—That it is wholly spiritual, depending neither for its bestowal nor removal upon any courts but those appointed by Christ for this end.—The sin and sacrilege of the civil magistrates attempting to interfere with any court of Christ in conferring or depriving of spiritual gifts.—Ordination must be true and scriptural, in order to be valid. (See cases of Culsamond and Glass.) 6. Ministerial walk and conversation.—That it be blameless, circumspect, &c. (See cases of Cambusnethan, Stranraer.)

V. Courts of Christ's church.—That they are spiritual, independent of civil tribunals, subordinate to Christ alone, constituted in his name, guided by his laws. (*Passim*.) That they are courts not simply for government and discipline, but also for strengthening the hands of the brethren in the work of the Lord—for recounting the doings of God, and the progress of the gospel, both at home and abroad—for mutual conference, praise, prayer, and reading the word; and for united intercession in behalf of all men, and supplication for the outpouring of the Spirit and the coming of the kingdom. (See reports of different committees daily opening of the court with reading, praise, and prayer.)

VI. The Eldership.—A spiritual office of Christ's appointment.—Election thereto by the free voice of Christ's people.—Trial of gifts for this office by the session. (See Act of the Elders.)

VII. Missions. 1. The church's care for her children at home. (Education—Church Extension—Employment of Probationers.) 2. Her care for her children that have gone from her to other lands. (Colonial Scheme.) 3. Her care for the Heathen. (India Mission.) 4. Her care for the Jews. (Jewish Scheme.) Her complete evangelistic character, beginning at her own children in Scotland, and then compassing the whole world in her zeal for Christ and love of souls.—Her testimony to the duty of contributing of our substance to the cause of Christ.—(Collections.)

VIII. Her care for the poor.—Inquiring into their condition, and providing both for their temporal and spiritual wants.

IX. Her zeal for the sanctity of the Sabbath, and her efforts for maintaining its sanctification.

X. Her desire for more frequent communion, seeking to remember Christ's death more frequently till he come.

XI. *Her catholic spirit.*—That the church is one body, one family, one temple, though called by many names, scattered over many regions of the earth, all being one in Christ, the Head.—(See Cancelling of the Schismatical Act of 1799—Reception of Deputations from England, Ireland, America, Prussia, Switzerland.—Correspondence to be opened with all these churches, and several others who hold the head.—The Memorial for Prayer.)

XII. *Her acknowledgment of God's providences and chastisements, calling on her members, and upon the nation at large, to humble themselves under the afflicting hand of God.*"

These things need no comment. If they be fruits of no higher or holier principle, than party spirit, or fanatical rage, or the love of priestly power, or any other baser influence such as has been so abundantly attributed to the evangelical party in the Church of Scotland during her late contentings—then all we say is this—a tree is *not* any longer known by its fruits—grapes do grow on thorns, and figs do grow on thistles.

It may be innocently suggested that the Free Church is not to be absolutely identified with the evangelical party in the late establishment, although the men of that party do confessedly form the Free Church; and that therefore this body will not show now the vigor, which *the party* did of old in the establishment. Indeed! Let the doings of *the two* Assemblies then, which met in Edinburgh in May last, *after the separation*, answer this: we desire no better illustration of the admission which even the London "Times" made, on occasion of the disruption, "that the very life and soul had gone out of the Establishment." Another London paper has drawn the contrast here suggested, in a few sentences:—

"We have on various occasions attempted to convey, by contrast, some idea of the respective characters of Evangelism and Moderateism in Scotland. That is now done to our hand with an effect which we should have despaired of achieving. Let any man but read the proceedings in the two Assemblies, and he will be at no loss, however unacquainted he may have previously been with ecclesiastical matters in Scotland, to form an opinion as to the comparative worth of the two systems. In the Civil Courts, or Erastian, Assembly, all is lifelessness and formality; there is an utter absence of *heart* in every thing that is said or done. The men who are the members of that body are a soulless set of beings. They speak and act as if they were moved by springs.

How striking the contrast presented by the proceedings of the Assembly of the Free Church. In that Assembly all is heart, and soul, and spirit. Religion is there seen to be a reality—a living, sustaining, invigorating principle. Every word that is uttered comes from the heart, and goes to the heart. The men are evidently sincere—they are in earnest. Nothing is done because it *must* be done; it is done because it *ought* to be done. It is not a sense of Court-of-Session necessity that prompts the doing of it; their conduct is the result of a conviction equally of duty and of privilege. To the Moderates everything ministerial is a task; to the Evangelical clergy everything connected with their sacred office is a pleasure. Hence the spirit and vitality which are visible in all the proceedings of the latter. Hence also the singularly strong sympathy which the public have evinced, and continue to evince, in their proceedings,—a sympathy which crowds to suffocation the building in which they meet, and the churches in which they minister, while the place of meeting of the Moderate Assembly, and the churches in which its members preach, are all but entirely deserted. Hence, above all, the fact that in the short space of ten weeks the extraordinary sum of £240 000 has been collected for the out going, or rather *out gone*, clergy. Supposing that the Moderates were, in the chapter of accidents, compelled to throw themselves on the free-will contributions of the people

for funds to build new churches, and to provide for their support,—will any of themselves tell us how much they think they would be able to raise! Would they, in all Scotland, obtain £5000? No, nor a fifth of the sum,—if, as in the case of the Non-Intrusionists,—they appealed only to the *religious* principle. The people have no sympathy with them; the people “scunner” at the thought of Moderateism. They regard it as a cold, heartless, negation, wholly unworthy the name of religion,—as hardly, indeed, deserving to be considered a tolerable system of morality.”

And yet there are some persons still, so insensible of the depth and the potency of those principles which have produced such results as we have now exhibited—principles which when put to the proof, have actually been found of force to overthrow the most solidly-based institution of the British Empire—(for if royal Oaths as the preliminary title to Sovereignty—if irrevocable Treaties of Union between independent kingdoms—if legislative Enactments solemnly declared to be for ever unalterable—cannot give stability to a Civil Fabric, what on earth can?)—there are men, we say, who still pretend to regard those events, and their causes, as matters, after all, of a mere transitory and superficial character—some short-lived excitement of religious bigotry or democratic rage,—a temporary or local party controversy—a mere popular *emute*—something, be it what it may, of which it may at least be said, *it is now all over*. All over, indeed! To us it seems but the beginning—well begun.

Why, we do most earnestly desire and hope that in the petty, narrow and ignorant view, which little men fallen on a great crisis, are sometimes pleased to take of this subject, as one of any interest whatever—“all” *may*, with truth, be said to be “now over.” The National Church of Scotland has fought her defensive battle with the State, and has won it—for she has succeeded in preserving inviolable all her spiritual rights and honors. Her contest was for something considerably dearer to her than her temporalities; and the loss of these, though no light matter, in itself, or in its consequences—does not diminish her victory, it only enhances it, her enemies themselves being judges. Yes! all this dusty suffocating turmoil of earth and earth’s politics, *is over*. How pleasant is the fact! The Church of our Fathers has witnessed a good confession, and is now, though not where she conceives she has a various right to be, at least *beyond the reach* of her most active worldly enemies. She has escaped by one free flight, from the snare of the fowler, and may look down now from that region of liberty and light into which she has soared, with very serene indifference as far as immediately concerns herself, upon the ruinous scene of her late warfare, strewn with fragments of abortive Parliamentary Bills and Ministerial Missives,—the scattered links of her broken chain. From the munition of rocks which is now her safe dwelling-place,—while for a short breathing-space she repairs her energies for mightier and more concentrated efforts in the great warfare to which every faithful Church of Christ must advance—she may regard now with complacency amounting almost to pity, the blank amazement of her baffled foes—the clamorous rush of sordid rivalries seizing upon those spoils of earth which she had spurned,



for the taint of Treason was on them—and, stranger sight or sound than all, the contentious gabble of a posthumous legislation busy in vain endeavour to mesmerize into the momentary semblance of a living Church of Christ, that exanimate Thing, on which the eyes of Protestant Christendom are beginning to gaze from every land with something of affright, and which lawyers call The Established Church of Scotland ! ESTABLISHED ON WHAT ? *Not* on the affections of the Christian people—for she has trampled their dearest rights under foot, and the heart of Scotland beats high against her ! *Not* on the force of Statutes—for the sole legal ground on which she stands, is an enactment in acknowledged violation of the Treaty of Union between the kingdoms—tremendous precedent for future spoliation when desirable ! *Not* on the Standards of the National Church—for these proclaim and assert an indefeasible government in spiritualities, distinct from that of the Civil Magistrate—and this she has absolutely surrendered ! *Not* on the admiring sympathies of foreign Churches,—for whilst their deputations crowd from all parts of the earth to do honor to the Free Church of Scotland, there are none—no, not one, so poor, so lost, as do *her* reverence ! *Not* on the Word of God—for this is the Divine Law, “Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar’s, but unto God the things that are God’s,”—which Law she has most deliberately broken !

## II.—OBITUARY NOTICE OF THE LATE REV. ROBERT M’CHEYNE OF DUNDEE.\*

[*The following beautiful Memoir of a faithful Minister of Christ, cut down in the flower of life—yet already most eminent by his piety, talents and usefulness in the Church—is from the pen of the Revd. Jas. Hamilton of London.*]

Amongst Christian men a “living epistle,” and amongst Christian ministers, an “able evangelist,” is rare. Mr. M’Cheyne was both ; and for the benefit of our readers, and to the praise of that grace which made him to differ, we would record a few particulars regarding one of whom we feel it no presumption to say that he was “a disciple whom Jesus loved.”

God had given him a light and nimble form, which inclined him in boyish days for feats of agility, and enabled him in more important years to go through much fatigue, till the mainspring of the heart was weakened by overworking or disease. God had also given him a mind of which such a frame was the appropriate receptacle—active, expeditious, full of enterprise, untiring, and ingenious. He had a kind and quiet eye, which found out the living and beautiful in nature, rather than the majestic and sublime. Withal, he had a pensive spirit, which loved to muse on what he saw, and a lively fancy, which scattered beauties of its own on what was already fair, and an idiom which expressed all his feelings exactly as he felt them, and gave simplicity and grace to the most common things he uttered. Besides, he had a delicate sensibility, a singularly tender manner, and an eminently

affectionate heart. These are some of the gifts which he received at first from God, and which would have made him an interesting character though the grace of God had never given more.

He was born at Edinburgh twenty-nine years ago, and received his education at its High School and its College. When it was that the most important of all changes passed upon him, we do not know, but the change itself is described in some stanzas on "Jehovah-Tsidkenu," with which many of our readers are doubtless acquainted, and which strikingly describe the difference between the emotions originating in a fine taste or tender feeling, and those which spring from precious faith. At the two periods of its history his own susceptible mind had experienced either class.

He was only one and twenty when he became a preacher of the gospel, and his first field of labour was Larbert, near Falkirk, where he was assistant minister about a year. That was the halcyon-day of the Scotch Establishment, before the civil power had laid its arrest on the energies of the Church and the hopes of the people. In every populous or neglected district, new places of worship were springing up with a rapidity which made gray-haired fathers weep for joy, thinking the glory of our second temple would surpass the glory of the first; and which promised in another generation to make Scotland a delightful land again. Among the rest, a new church was built to the westward of Dundee,—a district which combines almost every thing desirable in a parish,—not a few of the more intelligent and influential citizens in the near neighbourhood of its industrious artizans, whilst the flax-spinners of one locality are balanced by the almost rural population of another. The church was no sooner opened than it was occupied; and in selecting a minister, Mr. M'Cheyne was the choice of a unanimous congregation. He entered on his labours in St. Peter's, November 27, 1836, and, as an earnest of coming usefulness, his first sermon was blessed to the salvation of some souls. When he became more minutely acquainted with his people, he found a few that feared the Lord and called upon his name; but the great mass of his congregation were mere church-goers,—some with the form of godliness, and some without it, but exhibiting little evidence of being new creatures in Christ—whilst he found throughout his parish such an amount of dissipation, and irreverence, and Sabbath-breaking, as plainly told that it was long since Willison had ceased from his labours. The state of his people pressed the spirit of this man of God, and put him on exertions which were not too great for the emergency, but which were far beyond his strength. He knew that nothing short of a living union to the second Adam could save from eternal death; and he also knew that nothing short of a new character would indicate this new relation. He was often in an agony till he should see Christ formed in the hearts of his people; and all the fertility of his mind was expended in efforts to present Christ and His righteousness in an aspect likely to arrest or allure them. Like Moses, he spent much time in crying mightily to God in their behalf; and when he came out to meet them, the pathos of Jeremiah, and the benignity of John, were struggling in his bosom, and flitting over his transparent countenance by turns; and though he had much success, he had not all he wished, for he had not all his people. Many melted and were frozen up again; and many sat and listened to this ambassador of Christ spending his vital energies in beseeching them, as if he himself were merely an interesting study,—a phenomenon of earnestness. The vehemence of his desire, and the intensity of his exertions, destroyed his strength. It seemed as if the golden bowl were about to break; and after two years' labour, a palpitation of the heart constrained him to desist.

Each step of a good man is ordered by the Lord. This "step,"—the sickness of Mr. M'Cheyne,—led to the visit of our Deputation to Palestine,

and gave a great impulse to that concern for Israel which is now a characteristic of Scottish Christianity. And the temporary loss of their pastor was the infinite gain of St. Peter's church. When, after twelve months' separation, Mr. M'Cheyne returned, it was like a husbandman who has laid down lamenting that the heavens are brass, and awakes amidst a plenteous rain. During his absence a singular outpouring of the Spirit had come down on his parish, and the ministry of his substitute was the means of a remarkable revival. Mr. M'Cheyne came back to find a great concern for salvation pervading his flock; and many, whose carelessness had cost him bitter tears, "cleaving to the Lord with full purpose of heart." We remember the Thursday evening when he first met his people again,—the solemnity of his re-appearance in that pulpit, like one alive from the dead, his touching address, so true; "and I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech;" and the overwhelming greeting which awaited him in the crowded street when the service was done,—many who had almost hated his ministry before, now pressing near to bless him in the name of the Lord. From that time forward, with such discouragements as the impenitence of the ungodly, the inconsistency of flesh-pleasing professors, and the waywardness of real disciples occasionally caused him, his labours were wonderfully lightened. The presence of God was never wholly withdrawn, and besides some joyful communion-feasts, and several hallowed seasons of special prayer, almost every Sabbath brought its blessing. St. Peter's enjoyed a perennial awakening, a constant revival; and the effect was very manifest. We do not say that the whole congregation, or the whole parish, shared it. Far from it. But an unusual number adorned the doctrine; and it was interesting on a Sabbath afternoon to see, as you passed along the street, so many of the working people keeping holy the Sabbath,—often sitting for the full benefit of the fading light with their Bible or other book at the windows of their houses; and it was pleasant to think how many of these houses contained their pious inmates or praying families. But it was in the church itself that you felt all the peculiarity of the place; and after being used to its heart-tuned melodies, its deep devotion, and solemn assemblies, and knowing how many souls had there been born to God, we own that we never came in sight of St. Peter's spire, without feeling "God is there;" and to this hour memory refuses to let go, wrapt round in heavenly associations, the well-known chime of its gathering bell, the joyful burst of its parting psalm, and, above all, that tender, pensive voice which was to many "as though an angel spake to them."

(On Sabbath the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March he met his people for the last time. He felt weak, though his hearers did not think so. On the Tuesday following some ministerial duty called him out, and feeling very ill on his way home, he asked a friend to fulfil an engagement for him, which he had undertaken for the subsequent day. He also begged his medical attendant to follow him home; and on reaching his house, he set it in order, arranging his affairs, and then lay down on that bed from which he was never to arise. It was soon ascertained that, in visiting some people sick of the fever, he had caught the infection; and it was not long till the violence of the malady disturbed a mind unusually serene. At the outset of his trouble he seemed depressed, and once begged to be left alone for half an hour; when the attendant returned, he looked, relieved and happy, and said with a smile, "my soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler;" and thenceforward, till his mind began to wander, he was in perfect peace. During those last painful days of unconsciousness, he fancied he was engaged in his beloved work of preaching, and at other times prayed in a most touching manner, and at great length, for his people. His people were also praying for him; and on the evening of Friday se'nnight, when it

became known that his life was in danger, a weeping multitude assembled in St. Peter's, and with difficulty were dissuaded from continuing all night in supplication for him. Next morning he seemed a little revived, but it was only the gleam before the candle goes out. At a quarter past nine he expired; and all that day nothing was to be heard in the houses around but lamentation and great mourning, and, as a friend in that neighbourhood writes, "in passing along the high road you saw the faces of every one swollen with weeping." On Thursday last, his hallowed remains were laid in St. Peter's burying-ground, their proper resting-place, till these heavens pass away.

If asked to mention the mainspring of his abundant labours, as well as the secret of his holy, happy, and successful life, we would answer, "His faith was wonderful." Being rationally convinced on all those points, regarding which reason can form conclusions, and led by the spirit into those assurances which lie beyond the attainment of mere reason, he surrendered himself fully to the power of these ascertained realities. The redemption which has already been achieved, and the glory which is yet to be revealed, were as familiar to his daily convictions as the events of personal history; and he reposed with as undoubting confidence on the revealed love of the Father, Son, and Spirit, as ever he rested on the long-tried affection of his dearest earthly kindred. With the simplicity of a little child, he had received the kingdom of heaven; and, strengthened mightily by experience and the Spirit's indwelling, he held fast that which he had received.

A striking characteristic of his piety was absorbing love to the Lord Jesus. This was his ruling passion. It lightened all his labours, and made the reproaches which for Christ's sake sometimes fell on him, by identifying him more and more with his suffering Lord, unspeakably precious. He cared for no question unless his Master cared for it; and his main anxiety was to know the mind of Christ. *He once told a friend, "I bless God every morning I awake that I live in witnessing times."* And in a letter six months ago, he says, "I fear lest the enemy shall so contrive his measures, in Scotland as to divide the godly. May God make our way plain! It is comparatively easy to suffer when we see clearly that we are suffering members of Jesus." It were wrong not to mention the fact, that his public actings were a direct emanation from the most heavenly ingredient in his character,—his love and gratitude to the Divine Redeemer. In this he much resembled one whose *Letters* were almost daily his delight, Samuel Rutherford; and, like Rutherford, his adoring contemplations naturally gathered round them the imagery and language of the Song of Solomon. Indeed, he had preached so often on that beautiful book, that at last he had scarcely left himself a single text of its "good matter" which had not been discoursed on already. It was very observable that, though his deepest and finest feelings clothed themselves in fitting words, with scarcely any effort, when he was descanting on the glory or grace of Immanuel, he despaired of transferring to other minds the emotions which were overflowing his own; and after describing those excellencies which often made the careless wistful, and made disciples marvel, he left the theme with evident regret that where he saw so much he could say so little. And so rapidly did he advance in Scriptural and experimental acquaintance with Christ, that it was like one friend learning more of the mind of another. And we doubt not that when his hidden life is revealed, it will be found that his progressive holiness and usefulness coincided with those new aspects of endearment or majesty which, from time to time, he beheld in the face of Immanuel, just as the "authority" of his "gracious words," and the impressive sanctity of his demeanour, were so far a transference from Him who

spake as no man, ever spake, and lived as no man ever lived. In his case the words had palpable meaning, "Beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord."

More than any one whom we have ever known, had he learned to do everything in the name of the Lord Jesus. Amidst all his humility, and it was very deep, he had a prevailing consciousness that he was one of those who belong to Jesus; and it was from Him, his living Head, that he sought strength for the discharge of duty, and through Him, his Righteousness, that he sought the acceptance of his performances. The effect was to impart habitual tranquillity and composure to his spirit. He committed his ways to the Lord, and was sure that they would be brought to pass; and though his engagements were often numerous and pressing, he was enabled to go through them without hurry or perturbation. We can discern traces of this uniform self-possession in a matter so minute as his hand-writing. His most rapid notes show no symptoms of haste or bustle, but end in the same neat and regular style in which they began. And this quietness of spirit accompanied him into the most arduous labours and critical emergencies. His effort was to do all in the Surety; and he proved that promise, "Great peace have they which love thy law, and nothing shall offend them."

He gave himself to prayer. Like his blessed Master, he often rose up a great while before it was day, and spent the time in prayer, and singing psalms and hymns, and the devotional reading of that Word which dwelt so richly in him. His walks, and rides, and journeys were sanctified by prayer. The last time he was leaving London we accompanied him to the railway station. He chose a place in an empty carriage, hoping to employ the day in his beloved exercise; but the arrival of other passengers invaded his retirement. There was nothing which he liked so much as to go out into a solitary place and pray; and the ruined chapel of Invergowrie, and many other sequestered spots around Dundee, were the much-loved resorts where he often enjoyed sweet communion with God. Seldom have we known one so specific and yet reverential in his prayers; nor one whose confessions of sin united such self-loathing with such filial love. And now that "Moses my servant is dead," perhaps the heaviest loss to his brethren, his people, and the land, is the loss of his intercessions.

He was continually about his Master's business. He used to seal his letters with a sun going down behind the mountains, and the motto over it, "The night cometh." He felt that the time was short, and studiously sought to deepen this impression on his mind. To solemnize his spirit for the Sabbath's services he would visit some of his sick or dying hearers on the Saturday evening, and he usually preached like one who had come from an open grave. Having in himself a monitor that his own sun would go early down, he worked while it was day; and in his avidity to improve every opportunity frequently brought on attacks of dangerous illness. The autumn after his return from Palestine many of his hearers were in an anxious state; and on the Sabbath before the labouring people amongst them set out for the harvest-work in the country, like Paul at Troas, he could not desist from addressing them and praying with them. In one way or other, from morning to midnight, with scarcely a moment's interval, he was exhorting, and warning, and comforting them; and the consequence was an attack of fever, which brought him very low. But it was not only in preaching that he was thus faithful and importunate. He was instant in every season. In the houses of his people, and when he met them by the wayside, he would speak a kind and earnest word about their souls; and his words were like nails. They went in with such force, that they usually fastened in a sure place. An instance came to our knowledge long ago. He was amusing him-

self one day by surveying the operations of the workmen in a quarry, when passing the engine-house he stopped for a moment to look at it. The engine-man had just opened the furnace-door to feed it with fresh fuel; when gazing at the bright white glow within, Mr. M'Cheyne said to the man, in his own mild way, "Does that fire mind you of anything?" And he said no more, but passed on his way. The man had been very careless, but could not get rid of this solemn question. To him it was the Spirit's arrow. He had no rest till he found his way to St. Peter's Church; and we would fain hope that he has now fled from the wrath to come. His speech was seasoned with salt; and so were his letters. As we truly remarked in the discriminating and affectionate tribute to his memory, which appeared in the *Dundee Warder* last week, "Every note from his hand had a lasting interest about it; for his mind was so full of Christ that, even in writing about the most ordinary affairs, he contrived, by some natural turn, to introduce the glorious subject that was always uppermost with him." It was always quickening to hear from him. It was like climbing a hill, and when weary or lagging, hearing the voice of a friend who has got far up on the sunny heights, calling to you to arise and come away. The very subscriptions usually told where his treasure was. "Grace be with you, as Samuel Rutherford would have prayed," "Ever yours till we meet above," "Ever yours till glory dawn, Robert M. M'Cheyne."

The tenderness of his conscience,—the truthfulness of his character,—his deadness to the world,—his deep humility and exalted devotion,—his consuming love to Christ, and the painful solicitude with which he eyed everything affecting His honour,—the fidelity with which he denied himself, and told others of their faults or danger,—his meekness in bearing wrong, and his unwearied industry in doing good,—the mildness which tempered his unyielding firmness, and the jealousy for the Lord of Hosts which commanded, but did not supplant, the yearnings of a most affectionate heart,—rendered him altogether one of the loveliest specimens of the Spirit's workmanship. The flesh is reluctant to believe that one so endeared and engaging is gone; and though faith, remembering his walk with God, feels assured that "he is not, because God hath taken him," still even faith dares not to say that there was no righteous displeasure in the dispensation which took him from us *now*.

To speak with the plainness which such a solemn occasion justifies, or rather, to make the confession which this heavy visitation calls for, it must be owned that, whilst the possession of such a bright and shining light was the Church of Scotland's privilege, the rarity of such is the Church of Scotland's sin. When we consider the ability and orthodoxy of the pious portion of our ministry, it is mournful how little progress the work of God has made. It certainly has not stood still; but taking the labours and success of the seven short and feeble years allotted to this faithful evangelist for our standard, we almost feel as if the work had been going back. If few congregations have witnessed the scenes with which St. Peter's had become so happily familiar, one reason is, that few ministers preach with the fervour, the Christ-exalting simplicity, and the prayerful expectancy, of Robert M'Cheyne; and few follow out their preaching with the yet more impressive urgency of his gracious intercourse and consistent example. The voice of this loud Providence shall not have been uttered in vain if it impart new instance to the ministers, and new eagerness and solemnity to hearers—if it break up that conventional carnality which would restrain matters of eternal import to pulpits and Sabbath-days, and make it henceforth the business of the gospel ministry to win souls and tend them. Hireling shepherds will not regret the brother who is gone. His life and labours were a reproof to them. But if the many devout men, who, now

that Stephen has been carried to his burial, are making lamentation over him, would arise and follow him, even as he followed Christ, the present judgment would end in unprecedented blessing. Coming at this conjuncture, the death of this faithful witness is a striking call to ministerial disinterestedness and devotedness. "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." And whilst some are crying mournfully, "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?" we pray that many may find the answer in a double portion of Elijah's spirit descending on themselves.

*London, April 3rd, 1843.*

### III.—WHY NOT HELP US?

WHY NOT HELP US? Why not help us to build a House for the worship and service of our God?—this is the friendly question which we feel that we may now put in our turn, after having answered that which was asked of us, "Why separate?"—By a necessary but voluntary act of departure from evil, we have forfeited our civil supports, have been sundered from our ecclesiastical temporalities; and we are now left, as a distinct Christian body, without a House in which to maintain "the assembling of ourselves together:"—and being not yet many in number, having not much of this world's goods at disposal, yet having a great work to perform and a pressing emergency to meet, we feel constrained to look around on all our friends and brethren of every class and name, and ask them,

#### WHY NOT HELP US

1. WHY NOT HELP US, seeing we are your *fellow-Christians* in need?—This you will not deny, although there may exist between us a certain difference of judgment and action in regard to the immediate point of separation. Are we not of the same household of faith, the same brotherhood of truth, the same name of love, the name of CHRIST—are we not CHRISTIANS? Have we behaved ourselves intemperately, proudly, maliciously, selfishly, covetously, hypocritically, unchristianly? If so, you must not help us, but rebuke us. But, do you give us credit (as many have done) for sincerity, self-denial, quietness, consistency and zeal? Then consider, as Christians, whether you may not help Christians, in a Christian work—the work of securing a House in which to maintain Christian worship, Christian doctrine, Christian ordinances, and a Christian Ministry? May you help us, as your brethren, or may you not? Consider.

2. WHY NOT HELP US, since the grand occasion of our present circumstances has been the endeavour specially to *honour Christ*, our common LORD, in a manner agreeable to the statements made concerning his ecclesiastical headship in the word of God? We have been contending against the attempts of secular courts to interfere, on any pretext whatever, with the government, discipline, offices, ordi-

nances, and acts of the Church, all spiritual in their nature, and resting on the authority of CHRIST the only Head of the Church, as his will is revealed in his Statute-Book—the New-Testament. The Church of Scotland has ever maintained, and now with a mighty sacrifice, that no pope, nor king, nor court, nor judge, has any right to intermeddle with the ministry and membership of His Church, established or unestablished; because to CHRIST only are those ministers and members responsible in all their peculiar functions. And we now further declare that if the church, through ignorance, inadvertence, treachery, violence, or the will of a degenerate majority, find herself placed in circumstances involving compromise or surrender of the Supremacy of CHRIST, and the freedom of His Church, she must sacrifice all her advantages and take up her cross for the LORD JESUS CHRIST's sake. Is not this to honour HIM as best we can? Can you shew from His New Testament Law, that we are wrong? Can we exalt Him too much in the Church purchased with His blood?—if not, why not help us in this coronation Act?

3. WHY NOT HELP US, seeing that *we now are fighting your future battle?*—Let us suppose you members of what was lately our sister-establishment—the establishment of England. Your good and spiritual ministers feel and confess more and more, that their Church is weighed down by secular interference, and straitened by mere civil authority, so that there is almost no exercise of discipline, and no enjoyment of Church rights. Many of you feel and admit that there is a sad want of ecclesiastical freedom, of ministerial independence, and of laical privilege: and that without these, which are the very vitalities of Church-organization, your Church can never discharge her functions effectively, faithfully or spiritually. But all these are bestowed, and to be enjoyed, in CHRIST the HEAD; and without the avowal of the HEAD, you never can obtain the rights and powers of the *Members*. This is a law in the Kingdom of CHRIST—if you do not confess Him, He will not confess you. Your good men feel this—your honest men confess this—your holy ministers sigh for this—your pious laymen long for this—for this church-freedom in CHRIST the Head: Your day of contest is coming, you *must* fight and prolong that battle which we have now again began. There will yet be a FREE CHURCH in England, as in Scotland, formed from its Establishment:—this we doubt not. Help us then, ye right-minded men; for we are now fighting your future fight, as well as our own present one; and if we have been wounded and crippled, and weakened in the fight, and now ask you to help us,—remember what is written, “Blessed is he that considereth the case of the poor (or the weak)!—*The Lord will deliver him in the time of trouble.*” Then why not help us?

4. WHY NOT HELP US, seeing we now *suffer for conscience-sake?* This you may not, and probably, do not doubt. We have ever professed so; and we think that as a body we have given all reasonable proof of the sincerity of our profession. We felt that we could not any longer remain ecclesiastically incorporated with a Church, which had surrendered what was not its own to give, and had sinfully sub-



mitted in spiritual acts to secular powers, lest we should become "partakers of other men's sins." Nor is this conscientiousness of a vague and undefinable nature, incapable of expression or definition. It has respect to the word of God, and to fixed ecclesiastical principles laid down in the volume of CHRIST's will, as committed to His Church. Thus are we bound, not by judgment merely, but by conscience in that which has constituted the ground of our separation, and the occasion of our present appeal for help : and so bound, that if needful (as it is not now, but it once was), we should be ready to die for our present principles. True, it may be said, "Those on the adverse side are just as conscientious as you are—then, why help *you*?" We reply—1. As, in this case, they have gained, not lost, by conscientiousness ; 2. As, also, in this particular instance, we are not aware that they point to the Word of God as the ground of the course they have adopted; but to acts, decisions, and agreements of men ;—therefore, as on the other hand we have suffered loss for conscience ; and as we point definitively, directly, steadfastly and perpetually to the Word of God, therefore (we say) why not help *us* in our scriptural undertaking? For *Conscience's sake*, may you not aid *us*, and so help to strengthen principle, in its hour of trial?

5. WHY NOT HELP *us*, since our present object is the *erection of a House of Service for God, and for the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*? This is an object, surely, in which all may aid, who think that the multiplication of Christian means and instruments of usefulness in a vast city like Calcutta, is a thing desirable, a matter of paramount importance. We do not advocate the erection of splendid edifices, nor the multiplying of gorgeous and expensive structures ;—but, we do advocate the planting of many humble houses of prayer, and of preaching, through this and every such city ;—and if this cannot be done by any *one* body, then let it be done by all ; and so the whole work will be more nearly accomplished. Each new Church will present its own attractions to some who were never attracted before ; and will put forth its influence in confirmatory combination with those which have already existed. Need we say, also, that our Missions must depend much, if not chiefly, now, for *local* influence and support upon our ecclesiastical basis :—if cut off from one stock by a spiritual necessity, they *must* be engrafted on another. Every other Mission here has its Church basis, communicating to it stability and strength ; and why not help *ours* to the same? Why not, dear Christian friends, help us to build a House, where God may be worshipped, where CHRIST may be preached, where evangelical Missions may be supported, where sinners may be converted, where Christians may be confirmed, and where the standard of the Word of God may be maintained against Idolatry, Mahomedanism and Anti-christ?

6. WHY NOT HELP *us* ; for, *is not your heart secretly towards us*? We say—with confidence, for we know, that there are *some*, nay not a few, such persons ; persons who inwardly are more for us than against us, but from various reasons, do not join us. They have

always entertained a high, yea the highest respect for those men of God and Ministers of CHRIST with whom in Scotland we are associated :—They are persuaded that five hundred of the best and ablest Clergy, not to say one million of a thinking laity (if there be a thinking people on the earth), were not likely to mistake the right and the wrong of a question regarding their own Church establishment, to their own temporal loss, both as Ministers and people :—They see that the arguments of the suffering party are direct and not easy of answer, by conscience, by reason, by law, or by scripture, and that silence, power, civil appeal, or ecclesiastical majority, are the substitutes given for a distinct reply :—They feel the force of all this—their judgments are for us, their affections lean over to us, and their resolutions are distantly but weakly forming on our behalf ; but, they are afraid or ashamed to do more than think or wish. To *them* we say, Why not help us? for the witness of our cause is within you. You may plead, that it is inconsistent to help where you do not join ; but remember, that a divided self is far more inconsistent than divided property ;—that it is better to do something, than to do nothing ;—that beginning with a part, may lead to the completing the whole ;—and that where conscience prompts, and the heart leads, it is safer to yield than to refuse. Is it not so? think !

7. WHY NOT HELP US? we say to those *who have abundance of this world's wealth* : for they are able much to aid us. You have nothing that is not God's property ; and you have much that is His property : you are but His earthly stewards, entrusted with His gold and silver, for carrying out the ends of His government ;—and you have more than you yourselves do really need, but not more than you can improve for His service and for the welfare of the world :—and in a little time you will be required to restore to Him all that you have, and to render to Him an account of the past. Now we do beseech you to consider all this ; first, as it regards your own best and eternal interests, and then as it regards the particular claims presented to you for the trial of your fidelity by the GOD of Providence. Consider whether it may not be a part of your stewardship to regard the claim of helping to erect an additional HOUSE for the service of that GOD whose dependent servant you are, and for the gospel of that SAVIOUR, through whose blood alone your past arrears can be cancelled, and through whose righteousness alone your present services may be accepted !—Look on your earthly treasures, glance at your eternal accounts, consider your Saviour's claims, reckon over your present plans, listen to the still small voice within you, and say, whether will you not first give yourselves (if you have not already) up to CHRIST, and to His universal service ;—and then to His special suffering cause : do this, for your own sakes, *now* ; and perhaps among other ways of retrieving a neglected stewardship, you will find one near to you in the answer to our friendly question,

WHY NOT HELP US TO BUILD A HOUSE UNTO OUR GOD ?

## IV.—IMPRESSIONS ON THE SPOT.

*To the Editor of the Free Churchman.*

DEAR SIR,—As I had the pleasure of spending a considerable part of the autumn of 1839, and of the winter of 1840, in Scotland, and of mixing pretty extensively with the gentry, clergy, and people of various parts of it, I availed myself of the opportunity to acquaint myself with the real state of public feeling with reference to the Church; and as in the course of my inquiries I met with several circumstances that interested me at the time, I beg permission to recur to a few of them, which may interest your readers.

At one time I was staying at a house in the neighbourhood of Huntley, on the borders of Banffshire, and in the adjoining parish to Marnoch. The case of the Strathbogie Presbytery's conduct with respect to that parish, had just then occurred; and very great excitement prevailed regarding it. In the house where I was staying, two heritors of Marnoch, one of whom was an inhabitant, were visiting; and at another house, I met and staid with one of the deposed Strathbogie Ministers, and with another heritor of Marnoch. From these several persons, as well as from others who possessed local information, I made inquiries into the matter, and found that it stood thus:

The Minister of Marnoch being very aged, had an assistant allowed him, who served in the parish for about two years. In that time he became extremely unpopular; and so far as I could collect, deservedly so—on this all agreed. The Minister died; an election occurred in Banffshire; and for political reasons, Mr. Edwards this assistant, was presented to the parish by the trustees of Lord Fife, whose nephew was the successful candidate at the election. With the single exception of Lord Fife's agent, the whole parish protested against Mr. Edwards' being inducted into the Church, as their Minister. The General Assembly had resolved that no person should be intruded on reclaiming congregations; and had decided this, as a rule for their own guidance in the matter of ordination, and because they held the self-evident truth, that to establish such a forced pastoral relation, was altogether unscriptural. They therefore commanded the Strathbogie Presbytery not to take Mr. Edwards on his trials, with a view to his ordination. The majority of the Presbytery disobeyed this order, were censured, suspended, and finally deposed. The Courts of Law refused to recognize the suspension or deposition, and held them to be Ministers still; forbade the minority of the Presbytery, who had not been deposed, to act as a Presbytery; and upheld the deposed majority in their exercise of all spiritual functions, just as if their Church had never deposed them.

Now Sir, I can speak as a witness to the fact, that here was a case of an attempt, to force upon a reclaiming body of Christians, a person,

greatly obnoxious to them, who was not rejected by them without a trial. I apprehend that no one who has not mixed with parishioners upon whom it is designed to work such a wrong, can fully enter into their feelings. Let any Scotsman here in Calcutta, imagine a Highland parish, where the simple people have been accustomed to hear the gospel faithfully preached, threatened with the intrusion of a Minister, who, the people expect, may outlive them all; and who will be the only Minister in the parish; let him think of these people, with no near Church in any other parish; at least, with none nearer than about ten or fifteen miles; let him think of this intended Minister as a man exceedingly disliked, powerless as a preacher, reserved and unkind in his demeanour, and then let him think if it is fair, to charge the General Assembly with "wildness," and "radicalism," when it claims for these people, the right of having only such a Minister placed over them, as they respect and honor. For my part I can truly say, that though I have not been insensible to the high and sacred principles, which in subsequent parts of the recent struggle, have been developed; it was always enough for me to remember, that the one side wanted to protect these people, and the other side to leave them unprotected. And to adopt part of Lord Chatham's words, I must add, that "there may have been violence, but no man shall persuade me, that it was not the cause of tyranny, on the one hand, and of freedom on the other."

Let any man think for himself, how he would like to live in a parish, where contrary to his wishes, and the wishes of the great body of the people, a man was forcibly settled as his Minister,—contrary to the orders of the supreme Spiritual Assembly, and by the mere power of Civil Law. Let him think of himself for a moment, as a parishioner of Daviot, of Auchterarder, of Cusalmound, or of Marnoch; and then, lay his hand upon his heart, and sincerely say if he would not hail as deliverers, the secession kirk; and as blind guides, "lording it over God's heritage," the civil judges, and the clergy who abetted them. I believe that if every man would do unto others in this matter, as he would that they should do to him, we should have few, who would not be non-intrusionists.

But again, when the disobedient members of the Strathbogie Presbytery were deposed, the General Assembly found that the Civil Courts would not recognize their Churches as vacant. Nevertheless, in fact, these ministers had been deposed by the only authority that had ordained them,—the only authority that had power to depose them. Consequently the General Assembly was obliged to deal with their parishioners, as sheep without shepherds, and to supply them with other Ministers. Accordingly, Dr. Gordon, Mr. Guthrie, Dr. Candlish, and others, took their turn in occasional ministrations among them. What was then done by the Civil Courts? They interdicted any member of the Church preaching in those parishes, except the deposed Ministers! They did not say, as they may have had a right to do, you shall not preach in the Church, the Manse, or the Church yard; no; but they took the whole scope of the parishes, and said "you shall not preach

*here.* Infidel, Socialist, Papist—all may preach, but *you* shall not preach." Surely since the days when the Jewish rulers called the Apostles before them, and bade them not to speak any more in the name of Jesus, such a flagrant case of infraction of the inalienable right of every Christian, to proclaim the gospel everywhere, was scarcely even known. Dr. Gordon and all who preached, were served with copies of this interdict, and were held forth as rebels when they disobeyed. Oh Sir! What rebels were the Apostles! What rebels were Luther and the reformers! What rebels have perished in Piedmont! What rebels were Rutherford and Renwick, were Cameron, and the Covenanters!

Let me ask here also, if any Scotsman in this city, can imagine himself to be listless, if he were witness to this sort of usurpation by the civil power, of the Christians' dearest rights,—this impotent insult of venerable and holy men, who hear and obey that command—"Go, preach the Gospel to every creature?" According to the Courts of Law, none were to preach in those parishes, but Ministers who had been deposed, and such other persons, as were not sent by the General Assembly. And so, toleration meant "toleration for some;" liberty meant "freedom to disobey spiritual superiors;" and a new sort of five mile act, was by the force of the violence of the judges, imported into Scotland.

I remember well the sentiment of indignation, that filled my own mind, when I heard of this attempt to trample on a Church, which never would have been in connection with the state at all, but for the solemn assurances and guarantees, by which her spiritual independence, were said to be secured for ever. And really, when I think of respectable gentlemen in Calcutta, so far forgetting their country's history and their church's rights, as to smile complacently, while all the dear bought privileges of their fathers, are tamely surrendered, and preparing to send their annual representative to that General Assembly, which made this humiliating concession, I feel that time must have blunted the edge of their patriotism, or absence have chilled their blood—or perhaps, more charitably, that they have not duly weighed the facts, which made so powerful an impression on my own mind, and on the minds of nearly all their fellow countrymen at home.

Let me ask a member of St. Andrew's, to consider the case as applicable to this place. Let him suppose that the Chaplains here, had been deposed, and that then the Civil Court here, had said to Dr. Duff and the seceding Missionaries before they left the Church, "You shall not preach in this city—Hindoos may burn—Mussulmans may blaspheme—Papists may intrigue, but the Company pays the chaplains of St. Andrew's, and you shall not preach within the city they inhabit." What would be the feeling under such oppression; what would be the view of such persecution, when the light of Gospel truth and Gospel liberty, shone upon it?

I have been speaking of particular cases of injustice and oppression. I know that they might be multiplied; I know that the Civil Court interfered and encroached more and more, till at last it had encroached

on every single spiritual function with which the Erastian lawyers required it to meddle ; and I know that the great principle of Non-intrusion has since merged into a greater. This, I would not forget ; nor would I desire, that Non-intrusion which is now but a detail, should conceal that mightier principle. Only let us not, on the other hand, forget, that our struggle was based on a sound foundation—the rights of Christian people.

On that great doctrine which finally came to be the great point at issue, I need not say any thing, when so many have said so much, so well. But I do feel that it is a great and blessed provision, that the course of events in our contest for the rights of the poor, should have gradually evolved such a magnificent principle. We have found that our “Non-Intrusion” could not be surrendered, without the surrender, not merely of all the rights which the state had guaranteed to us, but also, and much more, of the Headship of our Lord Jesus. We have had to choose between taking our spiritual laws from civil judges, or from Christ’s Ministers : from the judicial bench, or from the true and only rightful “Minister of the Sanctuary.” And truly it is a great thing, to be found in these latter times, contending for the very principle, which was at issue at His earthly trial. He then owned himself a King, when his persecutors exclaimed “no King but Cæsar.” But ever since that time, he has gone on conquering and to conquer, and finally will come forth, before the assembled universe, as King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Well will it be for us, if He is peculiarly our King ; for, if we suffer and are scorned, even as He suffered, and was scorned, in maintaining his right to that authority, we shall at last reign as He will reign, when states and civil powers will be known no more.

Let me conclude with affectionately asking Scotsmen here, to weigh these things. Let them remember what it was that their fathers died for ; what it was that raised up their country to its present power ; what it was that secured for their church, amid all surrounding corruption, so much pure discipline and so much vital truth. It was its independence of the civil power. The Church of Scotland had no Ecclesiastical Courts at Doctor’s Commons, to which its Ministers were amenable ; the Sovereign was not its head ; it was allied to the state, only after it baffled every effort to enslave it ; and it joined not in that alliance, until it received pledges of freedom. And now, who can doubt, that that salient spring of all the Church’s life and usefulness, will nourish the Free Church which owns it, and that the remnant of the established church will droop and die, now that its source of strength is gone. We are, I am persuaded, on the Lord’s side ; and may well utter in the ears of those who refuse to join us, but rather persevere in opposing us : *Take heed lest haply ye be found even to fight against God*” (Acts v. 39.)—“If this be of God” ye cannot overthrow it.” Never ; no, Never.

I am, your obedient servant,

A. B.

## V.—HOME INTELLIGENCE AND SELECTIONS.

## 1.—THE AUGUST MAIL.

The only *political* intelligence which claims particular notice in our pages, is the passing of Lord Aberdeen's "Scotch Church Bill" through the House of Lords, and as far as its second reading in the Lower House. A great body of the Residuary Church dislike the Bill and exclaim vehemently against it; the Free Church it only affects as being very likely to add to its Adherents. The following Protests in the House of Lords are important memorials on this subject:

## PROTESTS.—CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

*Lord Breadalbane's Protest against the Church of Scotland Benefices Bill.*

Dissentient,

First,—Because this Act interferes with the concerns of the Church in a way that is inconsistent with its spiritual independence, it being unconstitutional for the Legislature to make any alteration in the government and discipline of the Church, or to prescribe the forms of the procedure of its courts, without the co-operation and sanction of the Church itself.

Second,—Because it is a fundamental principle of the Church of Scotland that no minister be intruded on a parish contrary to the will of the congregation; whereas by the present Bill this principle is wholly set aside, and another, viz., that no minister be appointed to a parish contrary to the will of the Presbytery and other Church courts, is established in its place, thus subverting an essential article of the Presbyterian Church.

Third,—Because by this Act both the Crown and lay patronage will be substantially transferred into the hands of the Presbyteries of the Church, thus creating an ecclesiastical domination subversive of the principles of civil liberty, and wholly repugnant to the principles of the Presbyterian Church.

(Signed,)

BREADALBANE.

*Lord Cottenham's Protest Against the Third Reading of the Scotch Church Benefices Bill.*

Dissentient,

First,—Because the Bill, so far as it professes to be declaratory, declares to be law that which is not now the law of Scotland.

Second,—Because the Bill, so far as it professes to be enactive, contains provisions which confer undue powers upon the Church courts, and are derogatory to the existing rights of patrons.

(Signed,)

COTTENHAM.

CAMPBELL.

ZETLAND (for the second reason).

LYTTELTON (for the first reason).

LANGDALE.

MONTEAGLE OF BANDON.

BREADALBANE.

DUNCANNON.

The Irish Presbyterian Church is displaying the enthusiastic sympathy in our cause, which was to have been expected : nor is her sympathy confined to words. Immense meetings have been held at Belfast, Newry, Armagh, Newton, Londonderry and Dublin, to receive the deputations from Scotland ; and £6,000 are already announced as the collections from Presbyterian Ulster alone, in favor of the Free Church of Scotland. Of the interest awakened in the cause in other quarters, at home it is impossible to give any adequate idea without entering into details, which our space does not at present permit. Numerous and crowded meetings in Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, &c., have been followed up by large subscriptions. From the following extracts, it will be seen how these things are viewed also in America :

(From the Witness of 2nd August.)

In our last paper we recorded the liberality of Mr. John Johnstone and Mr. James Lenox of New York, in having remitted a bill for £1,100 to the Rev. Mr. McMillan of Kirkcudbright, for the benefit of the Free Church in that locality, each of these gentlemen having contributed £500, and £100 being added by two anonymous individuals. Dr. Chalmers has since received from the same quarter another bill for £1,100, of which £100 were contributed by Mr. Lenox, and £100 by two persons anonymously. It is hoped that such examples of liberality from abroad will have a powerful reaction on the liberality of our friends at home ; and in particular, that the Building Committee might be enabled to enlarge its allowances of aid to all the poorer congregations of the Free Church. This forms the great and peculiar necessity of the present movement, as fully explained in No. II. of the Monthly Statement by the Financial Committee, which has just appeared, and to which we refer our readers, more particularly to the article on the increasing prosperity, yet increasing difficulties, of the Free Church.

In addition to the above, we extract the following from the *Watchman of the South*, a Virginian paper. Such truly Christian liberality should at once excite us, not only to thankfulness, but to redoubled exertion in behalf of the great cause now committed, as it were, to our care :—

"THE SCOTTISH FUND.—Several persons having expressed desire to contribute something as a token of their sympathy with the Church of Scotland, the editor of this paper gives notice that he will receive any such contributions, and forward them to Rev. Dr. Chalmers, for the general purposes of the Free Church of Scotland. It is desirable that all sums should be sent in at as early a day as practicable. We shall call the sums thus contributed, 'The Scottish Fund,' and shall probably remit a bill of exchange, as early as the *first* day of October next, or sooner, if the sums contributed shall make it desirable."

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

(From the *British Chronicle*, *American Paper*.)

This event, the most momentous of modern times, is at length consummated. The noblest branch of the visible Church, which the piety, and learning, and godly simplicity of past ages reared in the heart of Scotland, is in ruins. It is true the Church of Scotland could not boast of such wealthy benefices as some sister Churches. She had no sinecures and titles to bestow on the younger sons of noble families, but she possessed attributes of an infinitely higher order. She has preserved the truths of the gospel faithfully within her bounds, and her standards are as unchallengeable as they were two hundred years ago, when they came fresh from the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. The constitution of



her Courts has admirably preserved the fullest and purest expression of opinion, and has cherished and maintained these principles of civil and religious liberty, which form the glory of every land where they are possessed. Throwing off the weight of a party called by themselves *Moderate*, which had for many years retarded and cramped their exertions, the Church was advancing in a career of usefulness, and with an energy which could only proceed from the source of all good. Her extension at home, and missions abroad, were every year increasing with unexampled rapidity, and a long and splendid career appeared to be before her. But this brilliant prospect has, by the inscrutable decree of Him who orders all aright, been for the present utterly blasted. The Veto Law identified the ministers and the people, and for ever bound them in the bonds of mutual interest. The Civil Courts rudely overthrew that act, and the Legislature and Government have supported their decisions. The Church greatly increased its usefulness by the addition of new parishes, and as the population of the country extended, it was ready to meet that extension by a supply of religious instruction—but the Civil Courts annulled all these proceedings. They have even interfered with cases of Church discipline to such an extent that the last remains of a free Church had disappeared. The faithful ministers and elders of the Church have struggled hard to get a redress of these grievances, but it has all been denied. They have adopted the only alternative that remained—viz., to abandon the Establishment.

On Thursday 18th May, was exhibited at Edinburgh one of the most sublime scenes of Christian self-denial and devotion to the cause of truth, that the world has ever witnessed. The Evangelical party on that day left the Church of Scotland headed by their most eminent divines. The particulars are given at considerable length in our columns.

After perusing the ample details of this memorable transaction, the first feeling which possesses the mind is a profound sense of the excellence of the Christian revelation which influenced these men of God to devise a line of conduct so truly noble; and humble gratitude to that gracious Being who in that hour of trial strengthened them to complete the sacrifice. Our next feeling is admiration of the men who have given up all for the sake of religious freedom and a good conscience. See them issuing from the presence of the Representative of Royalty, and turning their back on all that secured support for their families, and on much which gave them honour and consequence in the eyes of the world. They marshal their ranks for their march to their new and humble Court of Assembly. They set out—no splendid military *cortege*—no dragon guards—no yeomen of the body guard—no military bands attend their steps—these have all disappeared; an attendance it must be admitted, but in indifferent keeping with a Church of Christ. But they are not alone. They have the invaluable testimony of a good cause—the approbation of the pious of the land, and, above all, on their right and left they are guarded by Him, whose faithfulness is a shield and buckler, and underneath them are the everlasting arms. Memorable day! How we congratulate those who witnessed its events. Five years of enjoyment at least, of ordinary life, were crowded into the short space of one day. The 18th of May will henceforth be held in perpetual memorial by the people of Scotland, and by the pious of many a foreign land. Its scenes are engraved on the hearts of the actors and witnesses. They will occupy the mind of him who is tottering on the verge of the grave, and will never fully leave him until they are replaced by the mighty realities of eternity. The young man who may yet pass half a century on this side the grave, will cherish the recollection to the latest hour of his existence, and after a century has elapsed, some hoary head will tell how he knew one who was present when the good ministers and elders left the Church of Scotland.

It may be said that this is the *mere poetry* of the transaction, but cold must that heart be, which cannot turn aside for a little space from the chilling influence of a world of calculations, and political economy, and contemplate the greatness of this transaction. We rejoice that Scotland has been honoured to set such an example to the world. Surrounded by enemies and scoffers who would not believe that such self-denial was possible, the Evangelical ministers of the Church have nobly redeemed their pledge.

The Residuary Assembly sat till the usual time, and next week we shall give a sketch of its proceedings also. Meantime we may mention that with eager haste they set aside a solemn judgment of a former Assembly, deposing the ministers of Strathbogie, without even going through the regular forms of court—they rescinded the Veto Act although it had been passed under the check of the Barrier Act by consent of all the Presbyteries, and revived the odious law of 1799, which debated all of a different persuasion from the pulpits of the Church. They unseated all the ministers of chapels of ease, and of lately erected churches. The chilling mantle of Moderatism was spread over the unhappy *residuum* with as skilful a hand as if Principal Robertson, Dr. Carlyle, or Dr. Hill had risen from the dead. This wreck of the Church of Scotland closed its proceedings at a quarter past one on Thursday morning, 409 persons in all being present.

The Free Presbyterian Church, when it broke up at one o'clock on Wednesday morning, had an attendance to witness the solemn closing scene of above 4000. This body will meet again at Glasgow in October. Up to Monday, 29th ult., the contributions amounted to £232,000, and several large sums were afterwards received. One just before the Assembly broke up of £2,000 was reported from Mr. Campbell of Tullochewan, for building churches in five parishes, with a permanent annual endowment of £20 to each.

Having closed this hasty sketch, we must revert to the proceedings of the Government. The Marquis of Breadalbane, at the last hour, continued to urge Lord Aberdeen for some Government measure—it was all in vain. That scion of the Metternich school gave him only evasive answers, and Lords Brougham and Campbell gave what almost amounted to abuse, and Sir James Graham, in the Lower House, on being pressed, acknowledged that 93 ministers and some elders had left the Church of Scotland!

Since the disruption Lord Aberdeen has given notice of his intention to introduce a bill about *quoad sacra* ministers, and with a gravity peculiar to him said, that he would do so as soon as possible as “the people of Scotland were very anxious about it.” Now the people of Scotland just care nothing at all about the matter. The Marquis of Breadalbane, since the change, has expressed himself in strong terms of disapproval of the conduct of Government, and has joined the Free Church. We have some remarks to make about the message which Sir James Graham has seen fit to send to Scotland in the name of her Majesty. It is perhaps the most objectionable communication from the throne since William III. was called to reign by the people of the three kingdoms; but we must reserve them till our next.

The following copy of an address received by Dr. Chalmers, is a specimen of many similar addresses, which have poured in on the Free Church from all parts of England and Wales. It is subscribed by 1,200 names:

#### ADDRESS TO THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

“*From the Ministers, Office-Bearers, and Members of the Congregational Churches (with other Friends of Religious Freedom and Christian Truth,) in the County of Sussex.*

“CHRISTIAN BRETHREN.—The proceedings in which you have recently asserted the demands of conscience and of Divine authority, have so much affected and interested us, that we beg to convey to you this our expression of Christian sympathy and congratulation.

“The noble stand which you have made for the supremacy of Christ in his kingdom will render ever memorable the 18th of May 1843. If the step be not unprecedented, it is at least worthy of your high character and standing in the Church of God. If your new organization be not perfect, the proceedings constitute a glorious advance in the direction of entire freedom of things spiritual

from the fetters of *State* captivity, preparing the way for a still more glorious triumph of evangelical principles.

"We hail with delight and gratitude the testimony which you have borne to the power of holy truth and Christian obligation; and most sincerely do we desire that your standing may be made secure, and your progress be made steadily prosperous, by the efficient agency of the Spirit of our God, to the glory of our great Redeemer.

"By cordial affection, by persevering prayer, and by every means in our power, we beg to assure you of the sincerity of our sympathy, and the reality of our esteem; desiring to be regarded as, in the faith and love of Christ.

"Yours ever, &c. &c. &c."

Addresses to the same effect have been received from the Somerset Association of Independent Ministers, from the Midland Baptist Association, from the Pastors of Congregational Churches in North Wales, from the West Riding of Yorkshire Association of Baptist Ministers, from the Western Association of Baptist Churches, from the Congregational Union of Ireland, from the East Kent Baptists, and from many other Evangelical Bodies.

If the difficulties of the Church are great and many—truly her encouragements on every hand, are great also. The tyranny of landlords, in ejecting their tenantry adhering to the Free Church—and in refusing sites for places of worship—seems to have somewhat abated. But there are some cruel cases still; none more so than that of the Duke of Sutherland's determined refusal to give so much as a foot square for that purpose, in all his princely territory, though petitioned by the almost unanimous Communicants of seven adjoining parishes embracing a population of 12,000 souls! Oh Moderateism! The same party's principles of toleration for the rights of conscience, are exhibited with equal force, though certainly in a more ludicrous manner, by the Reverend Dignitaries who preside in the ancient University of St. Andrew's, and who, (all staunch Residuaries,) have done themselves the very appropriate honor of memorializing the Secretary of State to remove *Sir David Brewster* from the high office of Principal, "in consequence of his having joined a hostile body of Dissenters from the Established Church!"

The Bi-centenary celebration of the Westminster Assembly, at Edinburgh, is to us the most striking event of the month; and in our next we hope to find room for considerable extracts from its proceedings, and also for other interesting selections. There is much touching evidence of reviving religion in our native land; and the tokens of increasing love and unity between all "who hold the Head," are cheering and gratifying in the extreme. The line of distinction—the only real line—which divides all mankind into two great classes, whether within, or beyond, the pales of visible communions, is now coming out into view even before the world; and it is quite clear that external professions, or Church privileges, or sectarian partialities, have longer the power they once had to sunder those who are "all one in Christ Jesus."

2.—FROM A SPEECH OF DR. CANDLISH'S AT A PUBLIC MEETING IN GLASGOW, 12TH JUNE 1843.

I thank God, that, the war of controversy is now substantially over. This Free Church of Scotland is now bound, not in controversy, but in another work altogether. God only knows how soon we may be required to enter again into discussion and trial; and we stand ready and prepared for bearing the same testimony in other times which we are enabled to bear now. The last great contest between truth and error, as some imagine, is nigh at hand. The forces may already be mustering for the battle. Certain it is, and it is a remarkable feature in the signs of the times, that the only two things which seem to be alive in this kingdom, the only two things which seem to have any spiritual life at all, or any energy, or vitality, or extensive power and energetic action, are Puseyism on the one hand, and Presbyterianism on the other. These two things, these two institutions are alive—there is spirit, and breath, and life in them; they alone are energetic; and all other forms and institutions seem to be worn out, lifeless. But Puseyism is instinct with spirit and life; and so, thanks be to God, is Presbyterianism—and as before, in former generations, the battle was concentrated into one single-handed contest, between these very principles, High Church Laudism on the one hand, and Scottish Covenanting principles on the other—as in former days the whole issue between God's truth and the devil's lie turned upon the contest between the scheme of which Land was at the head, and that system which had men like Henderson and Rutherford for its defenders—I say it may be that once more the old battle remains to be fought, and the old question is still to arise. There is but one truth;—truth is one, and error, as it has been said, is manifold; but I believe the events of coming years will show that if truth be one, error is one too. There is but one Christ and one Anti-Christ. There is but one truth of God, and one lie of Satan; and as all the diversities which prevail among the followers of Christ will ultimately disappear in one united impulse of zeal for his truth, so all the shades of difference that prevail among the followers of the devil, will ultimately be merged in the hot rage of one united onset on the truth, at the instigation of the father of lies. Meanwhile our course is clear. We are not to scan the unknown and unseen future. That belongs to God. The work given us to do is before us. The fields are already white unto the harvest. It was a solemn thought to which expression was given by a reverend brother in private the other day, that during the last two Sabbaths, probably more people had been brought within the sound of a preached gospel throughout the country, and that in circumstances peculiarly affecting, than there had been since the days of the first preaching of the Reformation. That this is true, let the crowded audiences which have filled this hall on these Sabbath-days testify. That this is true, let the crowds who have retired from our churches, unable to find accommodation in them, testify. That this is true, let the Highland highways and mountains testify, and the thousands who, under the broad canopy of heaven, have been hearing the words of eternal life. Oh, if it be so, what a responsibility is laid upon this Church! We have set the country in motion—we have turned the world upside down, as our enemies say—we have stirred up excitement and agitation—agitation is the favourite word—and even the world itself will hold us responsible for the use we have made of the excitement of men's minds. Are we to take advantage of this excite-

ment to preach a crusade against the Union, whose treaty has been broken? Are we to take advantage of this excitement to preach a crusade of rebellion? This is what the world expects. Oh, let us disappoint the expectations of the world! Let us take advantage of this movement of men's minds, not to preach sedition, not to excite resentment against authority, not even to make a great work about our own wrongs; but let us take advantage of it to win men's souls to Christ. After all the stir and excitement we have caused, the world would be delighted to see it end in political tumult, rebellion, and disaffection; let us disappoint the world. But it is a small thing to be judged of by men's judgment; let us remember that there is one that judgeth, even God. These deep movements in men's minds are not the work of the Church, but of the Spirit of God. Our principles are vital, and that the men who maintain them are earnest and honest, has been proved even to the world's conviction. But neither the vitality and magnitude of our principles, nor the earnest honesty of the men who hold them, can explain the deep movement in the minds of the Christian people of Scotland. It is the work of the good Spirit of God. It is seen from the work that it is the work of God's Spirit, by its peaceful character, by its orderly character, by its character of deep prayerful earnestness, by the supplications that ascend from many a heart, and the delight with which the people drink in whatever solemn truths are preached in their hearing. These things are the work, not of the factitious excitement of human passion and human zeal, but the work of the Spirit of God.

### 3.—PAYSONIANA.

[*Extracted from the Writings of the Rev. Dr. Edward Payson of Portland U.S.*]

**SELF-KNOWLEDGE.**—I have long considered a growing acquaintance with the desperate wickedness and surpassing deceitfulness of the heart, as almost the only mark of a real Christian which Satan cannot counterfeit.

**SIN.**—To assist you in estimating the criminality of sin, suppose that you yourself had committed *the first sin*—that before you were born, such a thing had never been heard or thought of. What a commotion would be excited throughout all Heaven and Earth! The dreadful news would spread like lightning through all ranks and orders of being, and all would join in an exclamation of horror—'It cannot be! where is the wretch who would dare to disobey Jehovah?' Suppose then, that you were obliged to come forward and stand in the view of the assembled universe of sinless beings, all regarding you with feelings of astonishment, detestation and horror, too strong for utterance—how inexpressibly dreadful would your sin then appear!

**PRIDE.**—Suppose a man builds a temple with one seat in it very high and much ornamented; and another very far below it. You ask him for whom these seats are designed, and he replies:—"Why, the most elevated one is for me, and the one below it is for God." You shudder at the horrible absurdity and impiety of such conduct. Yet 'thou art the man.' You have given yourself the first and highest place in your affections; you have thought more of pleasing yourself, than of pleasing God; in short you have in every thing preferred yourself before him.

LUKE xxiv. 50, 51.—‘And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, &c.’ Observe, ‘*while* he blessed them;’ the last thing he was ever seen to do on earth, was to *bless* his disciples. He went up, scattering blessings; and he has done nothing but bless them ever since.

GOD.—But great as my reasons are to love God for his favors, methinks he is infinitely more precious on account of his perfections. Creatures are all mere shadows and puppets. There is only one *Being* in the Universe, and that Being is God; may I add, he is *my* God. I long to go and see him in heaven. I long still more to stay and serve him on earth. Rather, I rejoice to be just where—and what—He pleases. Never did selfishness and pride appear so horrid. Never did I see myself to be such a monster—so totally dead to all wisdom and goodness. But I can point up, and say—*There* is my righteousness, my wisdom, my all. In the hands of Christ I lie passive and helpless, and am astonished to see how he can work in me. He does all; holds me up, carries me forward, works in me and by me; while I do nothing, and yet never worked faster in my life.

THE SAVIOUR.—Oh for a language suitable to speak his praises and describe his glory and beauty! But they cannot be described; they cannot be conceived; for “no man knoweth the Son but the Father.” What a wonderful idea does that text give us of the Son! Saints in Heaven do not know him perfectly; even the angels do not. None but the Father is able to comprehend all his excellence. Yet various, great, unsearchable and infinite as are his excellences, they are all ours; *our* Saviour, *our* Head, ‘*our* flesh and our bone.’ Oh wonder how passing wonder is this! Methinks if I could borrow for a moment, the archangel’s trump, and make Heaven, Earth and Hell, resound with ‘Worthy is the Lamb that was slain,’ I could contentedly drop into nothing. But no—I should wish to live, and make them resound with his name throughout all eternity. What a transporting thought; to spend an eternity in exalting God and the Lamb; in beholding their glory, and hearing them extolled by all creatures! this is heaven indeed. To be swallowed up and lost in God; to have our spirits embraced, wrapped up in his all-infolding Spirit; to forget ourselves, and think only of Him; to lose, in a manner, our own separate existence, and exist only in Him; to have His glory all in all to us:—this is indeed “a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.”

#### 4.—MISCELLANEOUS.

THE SABBATH.—‘How venerable is the Sabbath, considered simply as an Institution that has existed since the dawn of time! How many convulsions has it survived! The Fall came and shook the blossoms of the tree of life, and withered all the hues of Eden,—the Flood came and swept away the men and the monuments of preceding eras: since then, the tide of time has effaced the impressions made upon the world, as the ocean waves obliterate the prints upon the sand; empires have risen and fallen—cities been built and destroyed—civil codes enacted and repealed—systems of philosophy been popular and perished—the institutions of Numa and the laws of Lycurgus exist only in history—the hieroglyphics of Egyptian wisdom are worn out—the days of Thor, Saturn, and Woden are no more sacred; even the divinely appointed economy of Judah is terminated—the Urim and Thummim are departed—the mantle of prophecy, and the robe of priesthood,

have descended upon no successor. But notwithstanding all these changes, the Sabbath still exists, and still is the "Holy of the Lord and honourable!"—*The Revd. W. White.*

**RODERICK ROSS OF THE HILL.**—We have ever admired the reasoning as well as the resolution of Roderick Ross of the Hill, who was a plain decent farmer in the parish of Cromarty, about a century ago. It was then they began to intrude ministers upon the people; and had every parish been furnished with half-a-dozen such men, the struggle now commenced would have been maintained and triumphantly finished many a year ago. Roderick's laird was a Papist. He claimed the patronage of the parish. The people contested his claim, and, valuing a good minister more than money, they spent no less than £500 in the process, and gained it. Roderick's laird was a resolute man, and, though the law had found that he was not the patron, and the Crown left the election to the people, yet he was not to be beaten, and would force his tenants, and cottars, and dependants, to vote for his favourite on the day of election. On the evening of the day before, the laird called on Roderick, who faced him bluntly and boldly with this most pertinent question,—“What business had he, a Papist, meddling in the election of a Protestant minister?” “Observe,” added Roderick, by way of clenching the question, “observe, Captain, if ye ettle at serving us wi’ a minister, sound after your way o’ belief, I maun in conscience gi’e you a’ the hindrance I can, as the man must be an unsound Papisher to me; an’ if, what’s mare likely, ye just only wuss to oblige the callant Simpson wi’ a glebe an’ a manse, without meddling wi’ ony religion, it’s my part to oppose you baith—you for makin’ God’s Kirk meat an’ drink to an hireling,—him for takin’ it on sic terms.” Admirably reasoned, and nobly resolved. The laird had one answer,—no uncommon one now-a-days, both with landlords and factors,—“Roderick, you shall either vote for Mr. Simpson, or quit your farm at Whitsunday.” So ended the conference, but not the affair.

Roderick’s wife, though the weaker vessel, was not the least cunning of the two. She had heard from him what the landlord had threatened; and so, on the morning of the day of election, she watched her opportunity, and when her husband had so far arrayed himself in Sabbath-day order, she bolted out with his coat and waistcoat, and locked the door behind her, and through the key-hole advised the astonished man to go to his bed till the kirk had skailed. Fortunately for Roderick, there was a window, though a very small one, in the apartment, and, more fortunate still, the walls of the cottage were of turf, not of stone. He put his head through the hole, and, reducing his large bulk to the smallest possible dimensions, he at length succeeded in screwing his whole body through, and, without coat or waistcoat, and covered from head to heel with turf and mud, he pushed on to the church. “What brings you here in such a plight?” was the universal question, when the people, in this strange appearance recognised Roderick of the Hill. “I come here,” said he, in a voice that rang over that kirk, “to gi’e my vote as a free member o’ the Kirk in the election of this day; and as for the plight, ye may speer o’ that at the gudewife.” “And whom do you vote for,—Simpson or Henderson?” “For honest Mr. Henderson; and ill be his luck who votes for ae Roman out o’ the fear of another, or lets the the love o’ this world’s gear stand between him and his conscience—nay, man,” said he, turning to the captain, who was eyeing his tenant in deadly rage—“nay man,” said Roderick, “glower as ye list, I’m no obliged to be feared, tho’ ye choose to be angry.” Roderick’s appearance and resolution settled the day. The whole people were inspired with his courage. The roof of the kirk rang with shouts of “No Popish patron;” and the laird only came, as may lairds ever come in such a cause, to witness his own defeat.

The attempt which Roderick Ross of the Hill so successfully resisted,—the attempt to thrust a minister upon an unwilling people, is one against which common reason and common feeling, as well as Scripture, most loudly protest; and the wonder to us is, not that it should be now resisted, but only that it should have been so long submitted to.—*Miller, of Cromarty.*

**DR. GRANT'S DISCOVERY OF THE LOST TRIBES.**—In connection with the hope of Israel, and with the awakening hopes of Israel's friends, is it not a striking circumstance, that at this very conjuncture, the lost tribes of Israel should be found? With every wish to speak cautiously on a subject which has too often occasioned precipitate conclusions, we cannot omit this opportunity of calling the attention of our readers to some recent evidence on the subject, which we ourselves are unable to disbelieve, and which we trust that the church will investigate. It is to be found in the Travels of Dr. Asahel Grant, of the American Board of Missions.\* Unless they returned to Palestine, or migrated, to some other land, the likelihood is that the ten tribes remained in the locality where the king of Assyria put them. That they never returned to Palestine is notorious; that they ever migrated to any other land, is utterly unlikely, in the silence of all history, and in the absence of any known inducement. They still occupied their old seats beyond the Euphrates, in the days of Josephus. Four centuries later, when Jerome wrote, they still were there. Have there been any tidings of their migration since? But "beyond the Euphrates," is a wide word. Where, on the other side that flood, ought we to search for them? Obviously where the Assyrian conqueror planted them. And where was that? "In the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."† The country corresponding to this description is the modern Koordistan. It has been but little explored; and its mountain fastnesses, from the fierceness of the predatory tribes infesting them, have been visited by no traveller who has returned to tell his tale. Encompassed by these lawless hordes, and at no great distance from the lake Ooroomiah, is the territory of the independent Nestorians. Till now their country and their character were little known. But his medical skill having secured a safe passage through the treacherous Koords, Dr. Grant found himself in the valleys of the Nestorians. Like the Waldenses, protected by their Alpine fastnesses, this people dwells alone. Their aspect, language, and customs, are quite peculiar. They say that they are Beni Israel, and their physiognomy confirms the saying. They cannot be discriminated from the Jews of that region, by whom they are reluctantly acknowledged as apostate brethren. They profess Christianity, and go by the name of Nazarenes—a name bestowed on the Jewish Christians of the early ages. They dislike the name *Nestorian*, and say that they only agree with Nestorius in his protest against images, and in refusing to call the Virgin Mary mother of God. They allege that they received the gospel in the first century, and from the Apostles themselves.‡ The most primitive thing in their Christianity, is

\* 8vo., London, 1841. A short but very comprehensive abstract of the proof has been published by Mr. Henry Innes of London, in a tract entitled, "The Remnant of Assyria." Shaw, Southampton Row.

† 2 Kings xvii. 6.

‡ "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia," were present at Pentecost; and James must have been aware of Christians among others than the proper Jews, for he addresses his epistle "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad."



their abhorrence of idols. Of these they have a dread as Jewish as it is anti-popish and anti-patriarchal. Along with the New Testament sacraments, they have perpetuated a multitude of Jewish observances, such as the keeping of the passover, and many of the Mosaic rules regarding ceremonial defilement. They baptise their children when eight days old; they keep the Mosaic law in the "avenger of blood;" their language is a dialect of the ancient Syriac, and their family names are chiefly such as are found in the Old Testament. They allow that they do not all know the particular tribe from which they sprang. The present patriarch says that he is descended from Naphtali. Their numbers may amount to 200,000. There seems to be little spiritual life among them; but laying all the evidences together, there seems little room to doubt that they are part of "the house of Joseph, whom the Lord will gather out of Assyria, and bring into the land of Gilead and Lebanon."\* Should it so turn out, how wonderful that the discovery of these hidden ones should have been deferred to the present hour!—*Presbyterian Review for July, 1842.*

**THE HONOUR DUE TO CHRIST.**—If it be the will of the Father that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father, nothing less can be required of them than a holy, hearty love to him, and adoration of him, under every character by which he has manifested himself. But it is impossible to honour him, while we reject him in all or any of his offices. To honour an infallible teacher, is to place an implicit and unbounded confidence in all he says: to honour an advocate, is to commit our cause to him: to honour a physician is to trust our lives in his hands: and to honour a king, is to bow to his sceptre, and cheerfully to obey all his laws. These are characters under which Christ has manifested himself. To treat him in this manner, is to honour him; and to treat him otherwise, is to dishonour him.—(*Fuller on the Gospel.*)

## VI.—INDIAN INTELLIGENCE.

The Revd. Dr. Duff delivered at the Town Hall of Calcutta, on the evening of Tuesday the 19th instant, the first—and on Tuesday the 26th, the second—of a brief series of Lectures explanatory of the late events in the Church of Scotland. Both Lectures were most numerously attended. We hope in our next number, to give the first at full length to our readers, and the remaining Lectures (which we believe, will only be one or two) in succession after delivery. Of the intrinsic merit, or immediate success of these discourses, we shall prefer quoting in due time, the opinions of other journalists.

The Donations towards the building of a place of worship in Calcutta, in connexion with the Free Church of Scotland, amount now to

about Thirteen Thousand Rupees ; and the periodical subscription-list, or sustentation-fund as it may be called, though opened quite lately, is also in promising train. This last mentioned mode of contribution, is one which has been adopted at home with extraordinary success, the smallest sums insensibly accumulating by the steady onward progress of weekly, monthly or quarterly repetition—to something perfectly astonishing in the end, yet by a process entailing on the giver the least perceptible inconvenience. We earnestly recommend our friends, particularly those whose circumstances do not permit them to subscribe large round sums at once, immediately to adopt this admirable plan of monthly contributions, and to be assured that they will be most highly appreciated, however slight the amount may appear ; their aggregate result will amaze the givers themselves after a little time. The principle of *Non vi sed sæpe cadendo*, has never been more strikingly illustrated than in the success of Dr. Chalmers' penny-a-week collections in Scotland : and similar success may certainly be expected here.

The precise sum which may be *immediately* needed to carry out the extremely important object for which these subscriptions are invited—cannot of course be stated beforehand ; perhaps as much more as has already been communicated. But as the nature of the object becomes better understood—and the invitation more generally known—the attainment of the end in view will be accelerated and made more certain day by day through the extended efforts of multiplied friends in many places. We have the greatest reason to be thankful for the vigorous support which the cause has already obtained here, notwithstanding local and temporary adverse circumstances : and “through the good hand of our God upon us, in this good work,” we have a perfect confidence, that we shall ere long see it accomplished. But for this end it is absolutely necessary that our friends' exertions be strenuously continued, and let the proverb be remembered that “he gives twice who gives soon.”



THE

# FREE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. I.]                      SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1843.                      [No. 3.

I.—LECTURES EXPOSITORY OF THE PRINCIPLES,—THE MAINTENANCE OF WHICH HAS LED TO THE RECENT DISRUPTION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, AND THE CONSEQUENT FORMATION OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

LECTURE I.—THE SOLE AND SUPREME HEADSHIP OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST OVER THE CHURCH, EXPLAINED AND VINDICATED.—*Introduction—Christ's inherent Dominion as God—His accessory or Mediatorial Dominion—The Mediatorial Dominion in both its more extended and more restricted signification—In the latter sense it is twofold—Christ's Supreme Spiritual Headship expounded—His Supreme Ecclesiastical Headship variously illustrated—Conclusion.*

The Church of Scotland, the purest perhaps and most essentially Protestant National Establishment in Christendom, is now rent into twain. The greenest and most living half of the noble stem,—which for centuries, and especially of late years, has been insinuating its roots more deeply into the soil, and shooting its branches more widely into the atmosphere, and rearing its summit more loftily to the skies,—has been torn asunder from the common stock, and cast forth to seek for itself a lodgment and shelter, in the chilling breath of the East wind, or in the sympathies of a Nation's heart—in the castles of fancy and airy nothing, or in the clefts and crevices of the Rock of ages. And the surviving fragment of that once stately and venerable product of the olden times, shattered and bereft of the noblest of its trophies of ancient glory and renown, has been abandoned to the support of such props and buttresses as can be readily supplied by the fabled omnipotence of statutory law.

What, then, it may be asked, has been the cause of so strange, so unexpected a phenomenon,—or, if you will, so dire, so fell a catastrophe? Had it its origin in the haphazard scramble and frenzied competition for worldly honours or sordid aggrandisement? No:—Had it been so, the Church might now be standing entire—enriched

with the free-will offerings of the mighty, and basking in the sunshine of royal favours. Had it its origin from the capricious gusts and movements of mere secular politics? No:—Had it been so, the Church might now be standing entire—knit more closely than ever in its alliance with the State, and incorporated more intimately than ever with the inner texture and fabric of the British Constitution. Had it its origin in priestly intrigues and aspirations after a Lordly Spiritual despotism? No:—Had it been so, the Church might now be standing entire—and its ministers legally endowed with high powers and prerogatives, such as never before belonged to them, and such as reason and conscience and scripture taught the majority to spurn away. Had it its origin from the effervescence of popular commotion or any of the hurricanes of revolution? No:—

“It was not in the battle,  
No tempest gave the shock.”—

Had it been so, we should have been spared one of the strangest spectacles under the sun—even that of beholding the vital portion, with the veins and arteries through which the life-blood circulated—rudely severed from the parent stem, and apparently tossed adrift on the billows of confusion, while the residuary skeleton is seen to stand, as if it would mimic the semblance of stability and life!

What, then, it may still be asked, has been the cause of this phenomenon or catastrophe? As regards man, the immediate or proximate agent, the cause is not one but manifold. As regards God, the First or Supreme Efficient, through whose permission alone it could have occurred, we may not, with absolute assurance, determine, as we dare not venture to fathom the depths of his eternal counsels and infinite designs. But this we may, without presumption, be allowed to say, that in the progress and evolution of the mighty contest, which, for six thousand years has been carrying on between “the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent”—the children of light and the children of darkness—a new and grand and critical turning point has been reached. The “powers that be,” quitting their own proper functions and province, have, with what looks like the infatuation of judicial blindness, confederated against “the Lord and his Anointed.” They have gained a temporary triumph. They have filled the land with their pæans and their songs. They securely calculated on a permanent ascendancy. Though there be signs enough in the heaven above and on the earth below to rebuke their temerity, they still dream of empty visions. Despite all reminiscences of the past, all monitions of the present, all ominous presages of the future, they still cling with doating fondness, to the delusive hope, that they have set and fastened the very key-stone of conservative policy, while they have only effectually sapped and undermined one of the main pillars on which it ought to rest. They meant, honestly perhaps, to uphold; whereas, they have only successfully destroyed;—and not only destroyed, but succeeded in laying a combustible train which shall issue in results, as much above their power to arrest, as it was beyond their forecasting sagacity to foresee. Already, has the influence of

their great exploit extended to other and far distant lands. Already has it begun to be felt on the banks of the Ganges. Nor is it likely to pause in its onward career, till, with the prints and footsteps of its presence, it has permeated the globe.

Such being the momentous nature of the recent struggle between Church and State in Scotland, and such the magnitude of its present and prospective consequences, is it not incumbent on every reflecting mind to inquire more minutely into the nature and character of the *principles*, on account of which the unequal contest has so long been maintained? These principles, it will be found, are not of mushroom growth, neither are they of yesterday. They are not of local, provincial, or national import merely; neither are they of fleeting, ephemeral, perishable concern. No:—They have been of, old from the beginning; and the range of their operation is co-extensive with the globe; and the period of their duration runs parallel with eternity.

Neither let it be supposed that the intrinsic value or grandeur of the principles is to be estimated by the apparent insignificance of the chosen battle-field. It is not the remoteness, the narrowness, or the barrenness of local territory that constitutes the criterion of greatness in respect to high-toned principle, or moral force, or spiritual Truth. On the arid plain of Marathon and beneath the rugged cliffs of Thermopylæ, the heroic patriotism of one or two petty principalities of Greece earned for itself laurels, which have since inflamed the hearts of thousands, wherever the march of civilization has reached. On the isolated and bleak shores of Iona, was achieved a conquest over ignorance and barbarism, which diffused its quickening influence over neighbouring states, and far distant realms. In the obscure village of Wittemburgh was fought “the good fight,” which silenced the thunders of the Vatican, shook the sceptre from the right arm of civil and religious tyranny, liberated the human mind from the prison house of ages, and lighted a flame in the citadel and temple of truth which shall yet illumine the world. And has not this earth—the globe itself which we inhabit—whose comparative unimportance in the high scale of the Almighty’s workmanship is such that, by its annihilation, “the universe at large would suffer as little, in its splendour and variety, as the verdure and sublime magnitude of a forest would suffer by the fall of a single leaf:”—has not this little speck, amid the statelier worlds that bestrew the fields of immensity, been selected as the scene of the most stupendous of all conflicts—the conflict between the Prince of Light and the Potentates of Darkness—the conflict, in whose mighty issues, the flag of mercy was hung from the cross of satisfied justice, and the horrors of perdition exchanged for the hallelujahs of eternal joy?

Nor has Scotland been heretofore unhonoured as the field for determining the strength of antagonist principles fraught with the weal or the woe of nations. There, the ambition of all-grasping Rome first fairly grappled with the passion of patriotism; and there was she first most effectually taught that the “love of hearth and home” could inspire the poorest possessors of the sternest and wildest

of lands, with a spirit and energy that were more than a match for her invincible legions. There, was her Lordly Aristocratic neighbour of the South, at length constrained to learn, that the genuine spirit of liberty and independence could outlive the wear and tear of whole centuries of oppression; and, ever and anon, rallying into fresh vigour, could humble in the dust the pride and flower of all her chivalry. Thus roughly cradled amid the storms, and nurtured amid the tempests of troubled life, the character of the Scottish people grew up into a robustness and hardihood, and their principles of action into a tenacity of sinewy strength, that could not brook the touch of foreign tyranny. And it was true, in reference to their hereditary rights and unsundered privileges and free-formed institutions, that their attachment to these could only be paralleled with that which they bore to their own native hills:—

“And the loud torrent and the whirlwind’s roar,  
But bound them to their native mountains more.”

When the trumpet-blast of Reformation sounded through the land, this sturdiness of national character and love of independence were neither destroyed nor abated. The natural energies were not subdued but sanctified. They were only called forth and exemplified in a new and nobler sphere of action. Instead of any longer contending for mere civil immunities—such as personal liberty and security of property—the Scottish reformers rushed, with torrent or whirlwind force, to the vindication of the sacred rights of conscience, the freedom of Christian citizenship, and the sullied honours of their Divine King and Saviour. And such was the vigour of the onset, and such the success with which the mighty warfare was crowned, that in no country in Christendom was the blighting system of Anti-Christian Rome more thoroughly uprooted, and the reformed Doctrines of Protestantism—the eternal verities of Jehovah’s word—more rapidly, extensively, or firmly established.

Since then, the attempt has again and again been renewed by the powers of earth to coerce the Church of Scotland into sundry unscriptural compliances—to *force* her to abandon alike her Bible principles and her Bible constitution;—but in vain. She has, in consequence, been alternately in the furnace and in the palace—in the depths of adversity and on the heights of prosperity. But, whether in the one state or in the other, she has never been tempted or compelled to deliver up her sacred deposit. From the allurements and blandishments of courtly favour she has come forth untainted; from the fires and gibbets of persecution she has returned unscathed. And, up to this day, may she worthily adopt, as her peculiar emblem, the burning bush—the bush that burned with fire and yet was not consumed—and encircle it with her own chosen motto, flaming in colours of light, “*Nec tamen consumebatur.*”

From all this it may, in a general way, be gathered that the recent contentings of the Church of Scotland have been pre-eminently of a *religious* character. And it is this which renders the *precise nature and object* of the struggle so difficult of comprehension to the world

at large. Men of secular business apply to it their scales and their balances of profit and loss, and wonder why so many, claiming the attribute of common sense, should relinquish their substantial livings and their pleasant homes, for such antiquated and old-fashioned commodities as *scruples of conscience*. Men of physical science are so engrossed with the visible, the tangible, and the measurable that they wonder what those invisible, intangible, unmeasurable abstractions can be, which yet move the masses with a momentum of force that baffles alike all antecedent probability and all present calculation. Men of metaphysical philosophy, who have never soared beyond the cold, clear, frosty region of unsanctified intellect, wonder what those phenomena and impulses of spirit may be, that seem so mystical—so utterly unintelligible—and yet so potent practically in warming the hearts of the coldest, and quickening the activities of the most sluggish. Men of the law, thoroughly entangled in the meshes and cobwebs of sapless technicalities, wonder at the daring presumption of those who, looking beyond the letter to the spirit, vastly prefer the spirit that maketh alive to the letter that killeth. Men of statesmanship and general policy are so plunged into the vortex of utilitarianism and flexible diplomacy, that they not only wonder, but are lost in amazement and confounded altogether at so rare a spectacle of unearthly, unselfish, unbending principle—plainly confessing, with the Parliamentary Correspondent of a celebrated northern Baronet, who honestly exclaimed ;—“It is in vain to ask any opinion ; I do not understand one word about this Scottish question. What with intrusion and non-intrusion, church patronage and lay patronage, I have not brains for it, nor memory for it ; nor does any one that I know care a single straw about it. The whole question has addled my brains.”

The truth is, that the chief foundation of the question is not merely of a *general* religious or theological nature, but of an *essentially spiritual* character. Its *real* and *intrinsic* merits, therefore, can never be properly understood by the carnal mind, because these must be *spiritually* discerned. It is in this light mainly that the subject has all along been viewed by the pious clergy and people of Scotland. And it is in this very light, which presents by far its most important aspect, that it will not be viewed, and never can be appreciated by men of the world—whether learned or unlearned, public or private, professional or unprofessional. Still, though the more vital points and bearings cannot be adequately apprehended, or their inherent force and application adequately felt, by the average mass of mankind, there are certain broad and leading views that ought to commend themselves to the good sense of all who are able and willing to bestow the requisite share of reflection.

In one short sentence, it may be stated that the great principle or Doctrine, the resolute maintenance of which has led to the recent disruption of the established Church of Scotland, is, *the sole and supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ over his own Church.*



It is clear, therefore, that in order to appreciate in any degree, the real character and importance of the objects contended for, and on whose account sacrifices have been made on a scale of national magnitude perhaps without a parallel in the history of the world, it is indispensable to have somewhat distinct and definite views as to what is meant by *the supreme Headship of Christ*. To elucidate this subject, as the ground work of all that follows, is the main design of the present Lecture; and, in order to do this intelligibly, we must enter somewhat into the peculiar domain of Christian Theology.

While as yet there were no depths; before the mountains were settled; before the hills were brought forth; from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was;—The Eternal Mind, from his exalted eminence beheld, in the evolving events of Providence,† the race of Adam lying prostrate, grovelling and helpless, from the effects of a ruinous fall. Was this condition to be pronounced desperate or irremediable? A problem this, which, from its transcendental difficulties, might well have baffled all created intelligence for ever. But blessed be God, long ere created intelligence began to be—even in the counsels of an unfathomable eternity—the problem was divinely solved. There, between the Persons of the glorious Godhead, was the everlasting covenant entered into and conclusively settled;—the Father purposing in sovereign mercy, to elect—the Son, in boundless love, to redeem—and the Holy spirit, with efficacious grace, to apply the fruits of the purchased salvation. But, in order to redeem, it was necessary, in the human nature which had transgressed, to magnify the law by perfect obedience—necessary, in the human nature which had become obnoxious to wrath, to satisfy divine justice, by suffering the penalty, or an equivalent for the penalty, due to transgression. But, who could perfectly obey, and adequately suffer? What finite being could be equal to the infinite task? Behold, then, the plenitude of Jehovah's free grace and love! The Son of God, the Brightness of the Father's glory, resolves, in the fulness of time, to veil and shroud the lustre of all his glory,—assume the human form—obey, suffer and die as the Surety and the Substitute of sinners!

Here, then, opens upon us a distinct glimpse of the different relations which the Son—the second Person of the glorious Trinity—bears to us. As the Eternal Word, who in the beginning was with God and was God, he stands related to us as *Creator* and *Sovereign Lord*. As the Word incarnate—Immanuel—God with us—for the express purpose of recovering guilty man from the captivity of sin and Satan, and the fatal grasp of incensed justice, he has become our Kinsman-Redeemer. As partaker of the essential nature of both the parties at variance,—being, by the height of his inherent Divinity, on a level with the uncreated Father, and by the depth of his assumed humanity on a level with created man, he has become a real, a substantial *Mediator*, or *Daysman*, who is able to lay his hands upon us both—and thus reconcile the offended Majesty of Heaven with offending man.

Corresponding with this *twofold* relationship is his *twofold* dominion.

As God, the Son, equal with the Father, Jehovah's Fellow, he is possessed of Supreme Divinity. As such he lives and reigns—the Blessed and the only Potentate—the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords—by a right that is inalienable and unchangeable. As such, he hath a power that is essential—an authority, that is original and undervived—a sovereignty, that is absolute—an empire that is universal. This is his inherent dominion as God,—a dominion, which is his from everlasting to everlasting—a dominion, which he conducts and governs on universal principles and all-comprehending laws, suited to the boundless variety of its objects, and the real infructitude alike of its extent and its duration.

As Immanuel—God with us—the Mediator and Redeemer—he also possesses a peculiar kingdom or dominion, which as contradistinguished from the former, has been called the *Mediatorial*. In his *assumed* office and capacity as Mediator, he is, from the very nature of the case, subordinate to the Father. As under the ceremonial law, Prophets, Priests and Kings were designated and ordained, by the typical or sacramental anointing of material oil, so, was the great Anti-type of all such consecrated personages, designated and ordained to his great Mediatorial offices by an immediate unction from the Father and the Spirit—which announced his fitness for the special duties of his great enterprise—being thereby filled and replenished with all the gifts and graces of holiness and love, and invested with the fulness and sufficiency of all power and authority. It is in this view of his character, the scriptures declare that he was “made both Lord and Christ”—being “anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows”—and “set as king upon his holy hill of Zion.” To him therefore, who, for the sake of administering the economy of Redemption, took up the perfect humanity into close and irreparable union with his perfect divinity, the Mediatorial kingdom and dominion is altogether personal and peculiar. It is a kingdom and dominion which, from its very nature, he holds, and the functions of which he exercises by a right that is not inherent, but derived—a power, that is not essential, but communicated—an authority, that is not original, but delegated—a sovereignty, that is not absolute, but conferred. But though, from its very *nature* and *ends*, the Mediatorial kingdom and dominion must be accessory and derived, it is nevertheless just as *real*, as that which is inherent and incommunicable, because it is essentially divine. And in it, the Mediator is absolute and supreme, as of it he is the sole Head—the sovereign Lord—the Anointed King.

Now, the Mediatorial Kingdom and Dominion must be regarded in two great leading aspects ;—the one, more *general* and *unrestricted* ; the other, more *special* and *confined*.

As regards the *former*, there is an important sense in which it is to be viewed as truly *universal*. To the reflective mind it must be obvious, as by the glance of intuition, that the full realization of the

objects of the Redemptive economy imperatively demands the possession of a power, capable of reaching from heaven to earth and from earth to hell—a power, capable of controlling all the friendly and the hostile elements, alike of the moral and the physical creation—a power, therefore, unlimited in its sphere of exercise and uncontrollable in its sway. And this is the emphatic representation of sacred scripture. Before his ascension, the rising Saviour himself said, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” “All things are delivered unto me of my Father.” “Therefore,” says the Apostle, “God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.” He is “the head of all principality and power.” He “must reign till he put all enemies under his feet.” And he “hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church.” For “in that he put all things under him, he left nothing that is not put under him.”

Here, his derived, official, and delegated sovereignty, as Mediator, is declared to be co-extensive in the range of its exercise, with his inherent, essential and underived sovereignty, as God. For, who dare limit the *totality* of such absolute expressions as “all power in heaven and on earth”—“all principality and power”—“all enemies”—and “all things?”—All things in the heaven of heavens—angels and archangels, with all their hierarchies, he sends forth as ministering spirits to minister to the heirs of salvation.—All things in the visible heavens—sun, moon, and stars, he commissions to shed their varied influences.—All things on earth, rational and irrational, animate and inanimate—fire and heat—snow and vapours—stormy wind and tempest—mountains and all hills—fruitful trees and all cedars—beasts and all cattle—creeping things and flying fowls—kings of the earth and all people—princes and all judges of the earth,—all associations of men and dispensations of providence ;—all, all he modifies, controls, directs, and renders subservient to the promotion of his own glory, and the real welfare of his chosen ones, who are members of his mystical Body.—Yea, and all things under the earth—the great dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan with his apostate angels—he employs as scourges to inflict judicial retribution, or as vessels of wrath to receive the overflowings of his righteous indignation. But, between his *Original* and *Mediatorial* government there is no clashing. The *former* he conducts by general laws for general ends. The *latter* he conducts by peculiar and specific laws for the attainment of peculiar and specific ends. These ends are, the calling, and justifying, and sanctifying, and saving of lost sinners—the continued existence, extension, enlargement, and indefinite prosperity of the Church. For if, as Mediator, the Son hath been made “Head over all things,” it is expressly added that it is “to the Church,” or that it is, for the sake of the Church, that this universal Headship hath been conferred.

And this, at once, leads us to the *latter*, or more *special* and *confined* aspect of the Mediatorial Kingdom and Dominion.

If it be *to*, or, *for the sake of* the CHURCH, that the Mediator is made Head over all things, and *not to*, or for the sake of the *world*, or *universe* at large,—then, must there subsist a *peculiarly* endearing relationship—a relationship, altogether *unique*,—between him and the Church, which is declared to be his Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. And this is truly what the scriptures solemnly aver. In a peculiar, distinctive, and appropriating sense, he is “King of Zion”—“King of Saints”—“Head of the Church”—“Head of the Body, the Church”—“faithful as a Son in his own house, whose house we are.” The Church, then, is his special,—his peculiar kingdom. As it is, for its sake, its benefit, its tuition, its protection, its defence, that to Him have been committed the whole conduct and administration of the Mediatorial government, without any limits as to place or power,—so, it is in it that he reigns and rules pre-eminently—swaying the royal sceptre as its sole Head and Monarch.

Here, however, it must carefully be noted that his peculiar mediatorial relation, as sole King and Head over his own Church, stands in close and inseparable connection with his other mediatorial relations as its sole Prophet and Priest. Indeed, though these admit of being readily distinguished and separately illustrated, they are indissolubly conjoined—not only in the person of the Mediator, but in their actings, outgoings, and effects, as exemplified in the persons of the redeemed. But, however delightful it would be to expatiate on the prophetic and priestly offices, we must not forget that at present we have more particularly to do with his peculiar office as sole Head and King—the office which is essential to all the rest, and which alone renders them all truly effectual.\*

What then, is meant by the sole Headship or Kingship of Christ over the Church? What is involved, directly or inferentially, in that high and holy and divine appellation?

\* These Mediatorial offices were exercised in all ages. Under the Patriarchal and Mosaic Dispensations, he gave revelations, as a prophet; instituted typical sacrifices, as a priest; and delivered from enemies, as a king. In his humiliation, he acted, as a prophet, by orally communicating the will of God—as a priest, by actually “giving himself for us, as an offering and sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour”—as a king, in destroying the works of the devil, and vanquishing death and the grave. And the exercise of *each* of these functions is essential in every individual instance of conversion and salvation. In order to be converted and saved, is it not necessary to relinquish our own carnal knowledge, and receive saving knowledge from him, as our prophet—to renounce our own self-righteousness, which is as filthy rags, and receive his only justifying righteousness, as our priest—to reject our own self-will and self-determining propensities, and heartily submit to his authority and laws, as our king? In a word, is it not necessary to be taught by him, as a prophet—to have our sins atoned for by him, as a priest—to be subdued and made willing by him, as a king? And is it not essential that all these offices should be exercised, and all these effects realized, in constant and harmonious combination? If the priest purchases, the prophet must publish, and the king apply. For vain, would redemption itself be, even when purchased, if it were not made known; in vain

In order to render the answer more intelligible, it must be borne in remembrance that the Church has been constantly regarded in two very different lights ;—either *collectively*, as an organized whole ; or *individually*, in its separate members. Now, truly, the Lord Jesus Christ is Head and King in *both* these respects. He is Head and King of the Church as an aggregate whole ; and he is Head and King of every individual believer of which it is composed. But, though these two relations may be viewed as distinct, and admit of very distinct and specific applications, they were never, in the original intention or subsequent execution of the divine purposes, designed to be divorced or put asunder.

*First*, then, let us consider the doctrine of what, for distinction's sake, may be designated Christ's *supreme spiritual Headship*—or Headship, in reference to the souls of professing members of the Church, *individually*.

This may be very briefly unfolded. For, what is the condition of the people whom the Redeemer purposes to save? Are they not by nature mixed up as integral portions of a world lying in wickedness? Then, must he, by his sovereign power, as king, separate them. Are they not, through the influence of a perverse and stubborn will, utterly disinclined to return to God? He, as king, must subdue their stubbornness, and render them willing and obedient. Are they not, through hardness of heart and searedness of conscience, unable to perceive the necessity of a return? He, as king, must break the hard heart with the hammer of his word, and pierce the seared conscience with the arrows of correction. Are they not in bondage to sin? He, as king, must destroy its dominion. Are they not in thralldom to Satan? He, as king, must deliver them from his cruel yoke. Are they not weak and ever apt to stumble in the way? He, as king, must strengthen and uphold them by his all-sufficient grace. Are they not plagued with the remaining corruptions of the heart? He, as king, must wholly extirpate them. Are they not harassed with multitudinous errors set in array against them? He, as king, must eventually deliver them from the sway of all ignorance, infidelity, profanity, idolatry, and unbelief. Are they not assailed with troubles and afflictions? He, as king, must supply inward comforts, refreshments, and consolations. Are they not beset with trials and temptations? He, as king, must minister the necessary help, and support in the midst of them all. Are they not encompassed with enemies, numerous, subtle and powerful? He, as king, must control the factions of wicked men—defeat the machinations of Satan—overmaster the conspiracies and devices of principalities and powers, and spiritual wickednesses in high places. Thus, even

would it be made known, if it did not take effect ; and preposterously vain would it be to dream of that taking effect which was neither procured nor applied. But, such disjunction, or dis-association can never be. The decree of Jehovah is irreversible. And that decree is, that whoever, with a faith unfeigned, cordially embraces the blessed Saviour in any one of his Mediatorial offices, does, at one and the same time, substantially receive him in the saving efficacy of all.

in the present life, must all the foes of his people, without and within, visible and invisible, be eventually conquered by their heavenly king—sin, when its power is first broken in the soul,—the world, when stripped of its potency to charm,—Satan, when the penitent spirit has been rescued from his fatal grasp,—hell, when the heir of perdition has, through regenerating grace, become an heir of glory,—death and the grave, when believers in triumph exclaim, “Oh death where is thy sting? Oh grave where is thy victory?” And at the day of judgment, will the conquest be consummated;—sin destroyed,—the world in flames,—death and the grave annihilated,—the wicked doomed,—and Satan his angels cast into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone for ever more.

Such are some of the mighty triumphs of true believers through the power of their great Head and King. Truly, then is He invested with all the marks and ensigns of royalty,—a throne, a crown, a sceptre, and splendid retinue;—with all the badges and memorials of successful conquest,—a sword, and arrows, and weapons of heavenly temper, and trophies, and captives from the battle-field. But all is spiritual, all is glorious.—His throne, that of the converted heart; his crown, a crown of righteousness; his sceptre, a sceptre of mercy; his retinue, a magnificent array of the Christian graces; his sword, that of the spirit; his arrows, those of conviction; his weapons, love, patience, and truth; his trophies, the spoils of vanquished principalities; his captives, redeemed and ransomed souls, made willing in the day of his power.

Here, then, is the spiritual Headship or Kingship of the Lord Jesus Christ, over the soul of every individual believer. Here, he reigns supreme—reigns, by an indefeasible right which he hath purchased with his own blood, and vindicated by varied acts of his Almighty power. Here, surely, is He “all in all”—soul, body, and spirit being *his*, by right of redemption, conquest, and actual possession. What created power, then, in heaven, earth, or hell, has any right to come in between such redeemed spirits and their heavenly King? None—none whatsoever. Whoever presumes or dares to do so, must be denounced as the impious invader of a divinely fenced territory, the impious violator of divinely purchased rights, the impious spoliator of divinely conferred privileges! And what true believer could, for a moment, tolerate invasion, violation, spoliation such as this? None;—none can, none dare, without openly abjuring the name, and apostatizing from the faith of Jesus. To interfere here,—to attempt, by coercion or otherwise, to transfer the homage of the heart to any other Lord or Master than the Divine and Princely Saviour, whether heathen deity, or civil monarch, or ecclesiastic power,—is the simplest and most undisguised form of treason against him, who is truly King of Zion, and sole Head of his own ransomed people. And, rather than participate in the guilt of it, have not myriads of true believers actually laid down their lives? “Swear by the fortune of Cæsar”—“reproach Christ”—was the sum and substance of the demands of ancient persecutors. Compliance with these would have secured, not only life, but often honour, prosperity, and

renown ;—non-compliance, nought but insult, tortures, cruelties and death. With the full knowledge of all this how bravely were these demands resisted !—“Eighty and six years have I served Christ,” exclaimed an ancient worthy in the presence of his earthly judge, “and he hath never wronged me, and how can I blaspheme my King who hath saved me ?” “I have wild beasts,” angrily cried the proconsul. “Call them,” coolly replied the saint. “I will tame your spirit by fire,” said the former, still more incensed. “You threaten me with fire,” answered the fearless martyr, “which burns for a moment, and will be soon extinct ; but you are ignorant of the future judgment, and of the fire of eternal punishment reserved for the ungodly. But why do you delay ? Do what you please.”—“Your dignity is great, I acknowledge, but God ought to be obeyed before all things,” said another of the ancient worthies, when rudely challenged by the Roman Prefect for maintaining the divine majesty of God, as manifested in his incarnation in Jesus Christ, who has thus become the sole King and Saviour of his people. At these words the Prefect rose from his seat, and in a voice of thunder, indignantly exclaimed :—“How ! are you not afraid of incurring my resentment, of feeling the effects of my power ?” “What harm can you do me ?” was the prompt reply. “I have a thousand means of overwhelming you.” “What are they ?” “What ! confiscation, exile, torture, death !” “None of these can affect me. In all other things you will find us the most mild, the most accommodating among men ; but the moment the cause of God is concerned, we despise every thing. Glittering swords, burning braziers, famished tigers, and all the apparatus of the most cruel tortures are alike insignificant in our eyes. Exhaust all your threats ; have recourse to all your barbarities ; make use of all your authority ; call the emperor himself to your aid ;—you will never conquer our firmness, you will never persuade us to subscribe to the doctrines of impiety, even were your threats a thousand times more terrible.”

Oh, that the spirit of these ancient worthies would revive in us ! If we are indeed true believers, have we not the same motives of love and gratitude to impel us,—the same sacred rights and privileges faithfully to guard,—the same divine and kingly prerogatives to uphold and vindicate ? Is not their King, our King ? Is he not “the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever ?” And oh ! is he not a glorious King ? gloriously invested with Godlike qualities, and peerless perfections ? If all Royalties on earth, and all Princedoms in heaven were united in one bright constellation, oh, how poor, how insignificant would their most brilliant combined endowments appear in the presence of Him, who is our King—the King of glory—the King of Saints ? Think of his right to reign !—It is that of Mediator and Redeemer. Think of the duration of his monarchy !—It is eternal ; his goings forth have been of old from everlasting, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Think of his power !—It is unbounded. Of his wisdom !—It is infinite. Of his mercy !—It is great unto the heavens. Of his faithfulness !—It reacheth unto the clouds. Of his justice !—It is like the great mountains. Of his judgments !—They are a great deep. Of his meekness

and patience!—They are unparalleled in creation. Of his humility and condescension!—They are beyond the grasp of human thought. Of his tenderness and love!—They are an ocean, without a bottom and without a shore. Of his beauty and brightness—the streaming effulgence of his glory!—They outdazzle all created splendour. Of his treasures and riches!—They are exhaustless as the universe.

*Second.* But it is not the *supreme spiritual Headship* of the Lord Jesus Christ over *believers individually*, at least in any of its more direct forms, that the people of Scotland have been recently called on to contend. No;—It has been for what, by way of contradistinction, may be designated his *supreme ecclesiastical Headship*—or Headship in reference to the Church *collectively*, or the Church viewed as an *organized Society*. It is in this particular aspect of it that the supreme Headship of the Redeemer has been more immediately assailed by “the powers that be,” in our native land; for the maintenance of which in the abstract, the patriarch ministers and patriot citizens of our Zion, have made such unprecedented sacrifices; and in bearing testimony to which, ten thousand thousand friendly voices, echoing from hill and valley, and swiftly wafted across the ocean, now loudly challenge their self-exiled compeers in these realms of heathenism, to hasten and imitate so bright, so glorious an example.

Nor let it be thought that this is a point of *minor*, or *secondary* importance. Apart from the fact that it has *essential bearings* on the other view of the Headship of Christ—bearings which vitally affect its reality—it is in itself a doctrinal point of a character altogether fundamental and paramount. Let us endeavour briefly to exhibit it in this light.

The economy of Redemption contemplates the accomplishment of the most glorious ends, connected with the effectual call, the conversion, the justification, the sanctification, and final glorification of believers. How are these great ends ordinarily to be attained? How, except by the diligent and prayerful use of all the means, ordinances and institutions, wisely fitted and designed for their attainment? Those who are glorified must be sanctified; those who are sanctified, must be justified; those who are justified, must believe; those who believe, must be called; those who are called, must hear; those who hear, must have the word of life faithfully preached to them; those who preach must be duly qualified and sent. Again, those who have obtained the gift and grace of faith must publicly profess it before men; those who thus profess their faith before men, must be marked, distinguished, and separated from the world, in its maxims and habits, its principles and pursuits; those who are thus marked, distinguished, and separated, must be taught to walk habitually in conformity to the mind and will of him who is the Author and Finisher of their faith.

Now, all this, in the very nature of things, involves not merely the existence, but the necessary existence of a visible association and fellowship. A visible society, in its very nature, involves the necessity of organization and order. Organization and order involve of ne-



cessity direction, control, and discipline. Direction, control, and discipline involve of necessity a directive, controlling, and executive power,—in other words, jurisdiction and government. Jurisdiction and government involve of necessity the appointment of a class of duly qualified office-bearers, to whom the exercise of all sacred and responsible functions may be warrantably committed. And regularly appointed office-bearers, must discharge all their duties according to the laws and rules, established by him, whose servants they are.

And is it to be believed, that these, and all similar collateral points, the right ordering and settlement of which is imperatively demanded by the *very nature and end* of the institution of the Christian Church, have been left wholly unprovided for by Him who is its divine Head and Founder? Impossible. Whoever will in obedience to the divine command “search the Scriptures,” must soon be amazed at the abundance of instruction on all these subjects, in the varied forms, whether of positive precept, or administrative example, or incidental reference.

That there has existed a visible Society or Church, more or less perfectly organized, in unbroken continuity, sometimes contracting sometimes enlarging, through all ages and dispensations from Adam downwards,—and that onwards it will be perpetuated as “the pillar and ground of the truth” till the consummation of all things,—is to the Bible reader a fact as indisputable and as clear as that the sun has daily circled the heavens since the dawn of creation, and will still rejoice to run his course till the last trumpet sounds its knell. The word ordinarily rendered “Church,” denotes an assembly “called or convened by invitation or appointment,” and admirably portrays the marked and characteristic feature of God’s own people, in being called externally by the gospel message, and internally by effectual grace. Retaining the same rudimental idea, it is applied, with a varying latitude of signification, which may always be determined by the context, to denote either a small association of believers meeting together in a private house; or a regularly organized congregation assembling in a large edifice; or an aggregate of such congregations in a city, or district, or province, or kingdom; or the Catholic Church\* which is invisible, consisting of those only who are chosen out of a corrupt world and vitally united, by regenerating grace and saving faith, to Christ, as the living branches to the vine, or the living members of the body to the head; or, finally, the Catholic Church which is visible, consisting of all throughout the world who make a credible profession of their faith in Christ Jesus, and in all the doctrines taught by Him and his inspired Apostles. It is with the latter, that is, the Catholic or Universal Church, which is visible, and its various branches that we have more especially to do. For, however separated it may be, as to localities, or minor and subordinate points, or individual congregations, or aggregate national unions, all who hold in simplicity and truth the faith once delivered to the saints, who possess a duly qualified gospel ministry, and enjoy a scriptural administration of gospel ordinances,—all are integral

portions of that holy Catholic Body or Church of which Christ is the sole and supreme Head. By his sacred blood it hath been purchased; by the covenant which he ratified, it hath been incorporated; and by his divine authority, it hath been organized. To Him it owes its very being, its continuance, its objects and its ends. To whom, then, but to Him, can it be indebted for its frame work and constitution, its laws and ordinances, its discipline and government, its rights and privileges, and safety and all? And if He has divinely ordained all, and freely bestowed all, and unalterably secured all, what power on earth, or in the wide creation, can interfere, without an unhallowed invasion of his sacred prerogative as its sole Founder and Architect, Head and King?

To assure ourselves that all has been so ordained—so bestowed—so secured—we have only to open the Bible which is his own Royal Statute book—containing the Laws and Regulations of his peculiar kingdom—and from him deriving all their inherent vigour and constraining authority.

In the Bible,\* we find every thing connected with the *institutions and ordinances* of God's House, directly or inferentially prescribed by Him whose wisdom alone could devise, and whose power alone could execute. By Him have been established all the great and characteristic institutions and ordinances of public worship, saintly communion and fellowship, prayer and praise, the reading and especially the preaching of the word, and the baptismal and eucharistic solemnities. And are not these the very channels and conveyancers of the streams of grace and spiritual blessing from Him as their original fountain head? Is it not instrumentally by their means alone, that

\* Throughout, we take for granted, the great and fundamental article of Protestantism, viz. that the word of God is the only Statute-Book—the alone infallible test of whatever is right and proper, and true—the alone supreme standard of appeal. There, and there alone, are laid down by Christ the Head, and His inspired Apostles, all laws and rules whatsoever, relative to matters of faith, order, discipline and government, that are binding upon the conscience. These laws and rules, all professing disciples, whether ordinary members or office-bearers, are sacredly bound to defer to, to observe, to execute, or to obey. It is not left with them as a matter of choice, or option, or expediency, whether they will or will not. The obligation is paramount and peremptory. It cannot, by compromise, compact, or barter be got rid of or exchanged. It is in its very nature untransferrable. The very attempt to deduct from it, or get quit of it, or transfer it to any other, from any consideration whatever, is, by an act of what is worse than puny faith, to betray the most confidential of trusts—wantonly to surrender the most sacred of deposits.

These laws and rules, too, for the regulation of a spiritual society, which, in its more peculiar scope, intent, and ends, has nothing in common with purely civil, or political associations among men, it is altogether incompetent for any earthly power, civil, or ecclesiastical, lay or clerical, judicial or extra judicial, to tamper with, or modify, or supersede. They are laws and rules ordained by Him who alone has a divine right to ordain them. And to encroach on them, by one jot or tittle, is to hatch sedition, and stir up rebellion against Him, who is at once the great Head of the Church, and King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

sinner are usually converted, saints edified, the fruits of righteousness manifested, and the boundaries of the Church extended and enlarged through the world? Is it not, therefore, of supreme, of paramount importance, that they should be preserved in their divine purity, integrity and efficiency? What created power can pretend to alter or modify,—add ought to, or subtract any thing from them, without profanely invading the territory of the great King—without polluting its inmost sanctuary with sacrilegious touch—without entailing incalculable loss to man, and unspeakable dishonour to Messiah, the Prince?

In the Bible, we find every thing needful connected with *discipline* and *order*,—including the *qualifications* and *duties* of ordinary Church members—directly or inferentially declared. As the Church is a spiritual and peculiar society for spiritual and peculiar ends;—such as, the exhibition of the divine attributes to an unbelieving world, the maintenance of divine truth, and the advancement of the divine glory in the salvation of men—can it be a light, or trivial or subordinate point to fix and determine the character and qualifications of such as may lawfully be admitted into its communion, continued in the same, and consequently entitled to the enjoyment of its inestimable blessings? And who, but its Founder and Supreme Head, has any right or title to fix and determine all this? But all this he has amply and sufficiently done, either immediately through his own teaching, or mediately through that of his Apostles. In his own unerring word, every thing really needful, connected with the admission, continuance, and exclusion of members is clearly and largely delineated—the nature and qualities of the saving faith and sound knowledge which they ought to possess—the practical workings and experiences of true and vital religion in their souls—the manner and proof of their submission to the divine law, and observance of the divine ordinances—the types and models of that consistency of outward walk and conversation which should be exhibited to a careless or ungodly world—the maxims and principles that ought to regulate the ministration of reasonable reproof, the infliction of spiritual censures, and the enforcement of ultimate excision from the society and fellowship of the faithful. And if all this be, as we know it has been, authoritatively laid down by the great Head of the Church, as absolutely essential for the attainment of the ends for which it was constituted, must not the modification or supersession of any one item, by any alien power, civil or ecclesiastic—King, Pope, or Council—be denounced as a palpable subversion of its divinely prescribed order and discipline—a palpable distortion or annihilation of the divinely revealed characteristics of its membership—and a palpable infringement of the indefeasible rights of its supreme Head?

In the Bible, we find every thing needful, connected with *Jurisdiction* and *Government*—including the *qualifications* and *duties* of all office-bearers—directly or inferentially declared. Laws, it is proverbially said, cannot execute themselves; ordinances cannot administer themselves. Thus the Supreme Lawgiver and Judge is not visible to the

eye of sense. He does not legislate or rule in person. The administration of the affairs of his House he hath committed to faithful men, who must act solely in his name and by his authority. And if, considering the glorious ends of the Church on earth, the character and qualifications of its ordinary members are no secondary object, how much less can those of its spiritual rulers be deemed so? Who, then, has a right to delineate and exact these, except Him, whose servants and ministers they are? And has he not fully done so? Differences of opinion there may be, as to their precise nature and extent. But is not the case the same with every other essential point or article of faith? Is there one fundamental doctrine exempted from the charge? What has been more keenly and variously debated and controverted than the Divinity of the Blessed Saviour? What greater extremes, than the opposite and contradictory systems which have sprung out of that controversy? And yet, what orthodox believer would hesitate to say, that the subject is revealed in the sacred volume with the full blaze of inspiration?—or would, for a moment, hesitate to send the candid and honest inquirer, whether learned or unlearned, to its transparent testimony for the most ample and satisfactory solution of the whole question? So it is with our present subject. From ignorance, pride, prejudice, passion, self-interest, educational habits, carnal policy, secular ambition, and the ten thousand other influences that blind and pervert the judgment, and sear the conscience, or vitiate the heart, there may be wide differences of sentiment as to the precise number of *distinct orders*, and *relative degrees of power*. With such circumstantial differences, as to details, we have at present nothing to do. All that we have now to insist on, is, the *simple matter of fact*, that in the Church of Christ there is *real* jurisdiction and government, spiritual and ecclesiastical, of some kind—and that such jurisdiction and government has been, by divine authority, committed to a distinct class of office-bearers, duly called and duly qualified. In Apostolic times, some of these were invested with extraordinary and miraculous powers suited to the temporary necessities of a new dispensation. But coterminous with these, and successive to them, others were appointed agreeably to the laws and wants of an ordinary and permanent institution. In the Word of God, we read of “Elders that rule well being worthy of double honour;” of others, such as the Angel of the Church of Pergamos, being censured for holding laxly the reins of discipline; of common members being required to “obey them,” to “submit themselves unto them,” to “remember them that had the rule over them,” to “know those who laboured among them in holy things and were over them in the Lord.” Above all, we there find portrayed, with abundant fulness, the character, qualifications, and duties of pastors, overseers, and other rulers, who were called and entitled to exercise spiritual authority in the House of God. There, we find every thing needful connected with their required renewedness of heart—their illumination of understanding—their soundness in the faith—their unblemished manner of life—their zeal for the honour of God and good of souls—their dealings and

actings with mankind at large—their spiritual gifts, endowments, and graces, with all kindred qualities suited to the sacredness and responsibility of their office. There, too, we find every thing fully descanted on, relative to the discharge of their varied functions—such as—to preach or proclaim, as heralds, the word of life—to deliver, as ambassadors, the message of God to rebel sinners—to perpetuate, in simplicity and in truth, the observances of public worship—to judge of the fitness of candidates for church privileges—to celebrate the sacramental and sealing ordinances—to edify and build up the saints in their most holy faith—to console the afflicted, alarm the slumbering, admonish the careless, rebuke the erring, and excommunicate the reprobate.\* Here, as elsewhere, Christ is “all in all.” Are not the office-bearers,—appointed for instruction, rule, and government,—his ministers, his servants for duly managing the affairs of his House and Kingdom? Are they not qualified by him? Are they not ordained by his authority? Do they not discharge all functions and perform all duties in his name—with a reference to his mind and will—and for the promotion of his glory? Are not the truths taught by them, his truths? The laws enforced, his law? The ordinances celebrated, his ordinances? And if so, who has any right, whether Pope or Emperor, Angel or Devil, to interfere extraneously, without any warrant from Scripture, between Him, who is the Great Head and King, and his own chosen servants and messengers?

In the Bible, every thing is laid down connected with the reciprocal rights and privileges of office-bearers and people—not merely in their

\* Of all the powers involved in the possession of these qualifications and the exercise of these functions, not one is absolute or inherent. All are delegated and relative. They are not irresponsible, but held under the most solemn sense of accountability to God—not unlimited, but restricted and guarded at every point by the revealed will of him from whom alone they have been derived, for whom they are exercised, and to whom their issues, in time and eternity, belong. If the power be what has been technically styled “dogmatic,” or that which refers to articles of faith, it is in no sense originaive of what is new, but strictly interpretative of the inspired records. Whatever doctrine or principle is found to deviate by the slightest aberration from the pole-star of sacred writ, is to be banished as an intruder from the province of faith and an enemy to the well-being of the soul. If the power be what has been called the “diatactic” or ordaining, and which refers to points and matters of decency and order, it is not legislative, but simply executive—not autocratic, but purely administrative. It implies no right whatever to institute new ordinances, but merely a wise permission to devise or adopt such measures, as to minor points of external order, as may most effectually carry out the clearly revealed designs and purposes of the gospel-covenant—and all this, in most rigid conformity with the plain import and intent of Scripture, and the examples and models therein recorded. One rite or observance that cannot abide the test or touchstone of the sacred oracles, in their letter or spirit, or both, is to be rejected with loathing and abhorrence. If the power be what has been named the “diacritic” or disciplinary, and which refers to the entrance, the continuance and the exclusion of Church members, it is not lordly or magisterial, but purely ministerial—not civil, extending to person, life or property, but wholly spiritual, reaching to the understanding and the conscience, and confined to the infliction of moral censure in one or other of its varied forms ;—any thing differing materially or essentially from the infallible standard of God’s word being utterly repudiated.

individual, spiritual capacity as believers, but also in their collective ecclesiastical capacity as members of a Church, or visible organized society. Of such rights or privileges the most important are those involved in the examination, the election, and the ordination of Pastors, to take the oversight of particular congregations of the faithful. The subject is too vast to admit of being entered on here. This much, however, we feel warranted to say, as, in our belief, capable of demonstration, viz., that—from the nature and necessities of the case—the cravings and longings of the regenerated nature,—the inalienable rights of private judgment—the fitness and aptitude, and responsibility of God's own adopted children in judging of what is the true bread of life,—the whole scope and tenour of sacred writ, together with many of its express precepts, and unchanging general principles, and authoritative examples—\*we are shut up to the conclu-

\* If Scripture had been wholly silent, both as regards precept and example, we could not but deduce this right, as a necessary inference from great and immutable principles. What is one chief design of the Christian Ministry? Is it not to feed souls with the bread and water of life?—with sound and wholesome gospel truth—which is the food and nourishment of the soul? Well, are intelligent rational creatures, endowed with understanding and conscience, and responsible to God for the use and exercise of both, to have nothing to say in reference to the wholesome or unwholesome quality of the spiritual food ministered to them? Does our temporal life depend on the beneficial or injurious qualities of "our daily bread?" Are we endowed physically with five senses, each one of which may be employed, directly or indirectly, in discriminating the harmless from the deleterious—the positively nutritive from the positively poisonous? And being so endowed, are we not answerable for the use of them? or, if we neglect, and perish through the neglect, are we not guilty of carelessly throwing away the life that God has given us? And does not this partake of the criminality of a suicidal act? If so, as regards the body, Oh! how vastly more important as regards the soul! Does not its nourishment or starvation—its life or its death—its salvation or its perdition—depend on the good or bad, the sound or noxious quality of the spiritual aliment administered—the doctrines taught? And have God's people, from the mere fact of their being so, spiritual senses which may be exercised in distinguishing the good from the bad—the sound from the noxious? And shall they not so use them? Having ears to hear, shall they give no heed to what they hear? Having the eyes of their understanding opened to see, shall they not discern between the beauty of truth and the deformity of error? Having a spiritual taste, and savour, and unction from the Holy One, shall they shew no decided relish and preference for the heavenly manna—the delicacies and fragrances of God's own table and feast of love? Having hearts and consciences to feel, shall they be insensible to the soundness or erroneousness of impressions, and form no judgment as to right and wrong? If God's people neglect to exercise these, their spiritual senses,—and if, in consequence, they famish and ultimately perish,—is not the neglect as criminal, in regard to God, who conferred them, as it is manifestly perilous and fatal to the soul? The bestowal of the spiritual sense or faculty is a privilege; the possession of it, when bestowed, a sacred right; and the exercise of it, when possessed, a sacred duty,—which we owe at once to the Divine Giver, and our own souls!

But, we are not left to inference alone, however valid. Scripture contains both precept and example, that have an essential bearing, more or less direct, on the important subject. Of the preceptive parts, a portion has been thus condensed and briefly commented on by a recent author:—

"You will please to observe the passage in the 10th of John, the 8th verse. 'all that ever came before me were thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not

sion that both office-bearers and people have an important part to act in the management of a transaction so essential to the spiritual welfare and prosperity of the Church,—that, on the one hand, in some form or other, suited to varying circumstances of time and place, the people

hear them.' Christ here commends the private members of the Church, because, in the exercise of an undoubted right, and in the discharge of a paramount duty, of judging and trying the doctrine of public teachers by the standard of 'the law and the testimony,' they had refused to listen to certain, who, however they might have come into the Church according to ecclesiastical form, were, in reality, no better than 'thieves and robbers.' 'The sheep,' says he, 'did not hear them.' Of course, this is only one of a numerous class of scriptures, of which it will be best to give one or two examples, before building any conclusions upon them. 'Beware,' says Christ, 'of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves.' 'Thus saith the Lord, 'harken not unto the words of the prophets that prophecy unto you: they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord.' 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed.' 'Take heed that no man deceive you: there shall arise false Christs and false prophets.' 'If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.' 'Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand.' 'Every one of us shall give account of himself to God.' 'Be not ye called master, for one is your master, even Christ.' 'Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.' The sum of these texts taken together, is briefly and manifestly this: that every Christian man, in the matters of his immortal soul, has to do with God alone—that he has one only 'master, even Christ'—that to him he must give account, 'bearing his own burden,' in the judgement of the great day,—and that no power on earth may dictate to him what master he shall hear, to what spiritual instructions he shall listen:—'Not for that we have dominion over your faith,'—'the sheep did not hear them,'—'one is your master,'—'beware of false prophets,'—'try the spirits whether they be of God.' Really the matter of forcing a pastor is so clear in the case of an individual soul, that I can scarce imagine a man out of the Popish Church feeling the least hesitation in regard to it. For any court, civil or ecclesiastical, to lay hold of a man, and say,—Sir, this is your pastor,—you are one of his flock,—we appoint him over you,—to him you owe subjection in the Lord,—at his mouth you must receive that word of the Lord, at his hand the sacraments of the Lord; what is this but Popery, scarce in disguise,—'lording it over the heritage of God,' and claiming a dominion over faith and conscience, which even apostles never thought of assuming. 'Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?' Can you answer for his soul at the judgement? By all means be his master now, if you are to be his judge then. You say he is one of this man's flock. How can you make him one of this man's flock? You may give your minister a stipend, and style him pastor of a district, if you will. But the pastor of this man's soul he can never become in point of fact, but by his own consent; and that consent he not only is not bound to give,—he dare not give it, till he have complied with Christ's command, 'try the spirits whether they be of God,'—till after serious and prayerful deliberation, he have satisfied himself that he may wait upon the ministry of this man with safety and with profit to his soul.

"If, however, in the case of an individual Christian, the pastoral tie can be formed only with his full consent, the same evidently must hold of a congregation, which is nothing else than a plurality of Christians gathered into one body, bound by the same duties, and entitled to the same rights and privileges which belong to them individually. It is with the souls, not the benefice, or the building, that the pastoral tie is formed. If consent be necessary in the case of one soul, it must be at least as indispensable in the case of hundreds. Of course, should a congregation differ in judgment, the mind of the major part is the mind

are entitled to have a potential voice of acquiescence or consent, are entitled to put forth an influential expression of their mind and will, in the choice of a Pastor;—and that, on the other hand, the office-bearers have an equally undoubted right and privilege to interpose an

of the congregation. Even the minority, however, are not forced to accept the pastor. Over and above the power of laying their objections before the office-bearers, they have always the option of leaving the congregation, if they can by no means in the end give their consent, the law of Christ having been complied with to the utmost extent the nature of the case admits. I need scarcely add, that it does not affect the argument in the slightest degree, that a congregation may occasionally abuse their privilege, and reject a pastor on unwarrantable grounds. Doubtless they may, and so may the office-bearers abuse their undoubted powers and privileges. But no one proposes on that account to take these away. No more may the private members of the Church be spoiled of their proper rights, and prevented discharging their indispensable duties, because the one may sometimes be abused, and sins occasionally be committed under cloak of the other. If we would not subvert all order and justice in the Church together, it must be our simple object to ascertain, from God's word, what the proper rights and privileges of the different parties in this matter are, thereafter holding them sacred and inviolable, and guarding against abuses by such methods only as the word of God prescribes; never, assuredly, by the transference to one party of privileges which belong essentially and inalienably to another."

Besides indirect allusions and references of a very significant character, there are two very marked examples which have all the weight and sanction of Apostolic authority. The *one* expressly points out the share which the assembled 120 disciples had in nominating *two*, possessed of the prescribed qualifications,—one of whom was to be ordained to the Apostolate, from which Judas by transgression fell. Acts, chap. 1st. The *other* is the election of Deacons. Acts, chap. 6th. In both these cases, the process is very clear; and the principle involved in it is very perspicuous. It devolved on the Apostles, or regularly appointed office-bearers at the time, to declare the necessary qualifications. It devolved on the multitude of disciples to look out for and to nominate a particular individual so qualified. The Christian people and office-bearers, have each, though in a different way, a potential voice in the election. Each have their specific rights and duties. The former are required "to try the spirits." And what man or body of men has any right to interpose between them and their obligation to obey this divine command? The office-bearers, on the other hand, are enjoined to "lay hands suddenly on no man"—and "what they have received to commit to faithful men." If, then, the persons nominated do not, in their mind, possess the requisite qualifications—if they be not "faithful men"—they must not be ordained. And what man, or body of men, has any right to interpose between them and their duty to him, under whose commands they are bound to act? It is thus clear that, in the matter of electing office-bearers, both the previously existing office-bearers, and the private members have rights to exercise and duties to perform, in the exercise and discharge of which they are severally responsible—yea, personally and individually responsible—to their only Lord and Head, Jesus Christ.

The connection between the rights and duties of office-bearers and people, respectively, in this matter, and the doctrine of Christ's Supreme Headship over them, has been thus reduced to the convenient form of a syllogism. The simple and indisputable principle assumed is—"that if a man be responsible he must be free—if a man be responsible to Christ as his master, then no man, be he Pope or Prince, and no Body of men, shall come in between that man's conscience and the authority of his Lord. Now, observe the syllogism—the major proposition is this, wherever there is personal responsibility to Christ, there must be perfect freedom to serve Christ, according to the rule of his word and the dictates of an enlightened conscience. That is the *general principle*—the *major proposition*. And this is the *fact* or *minor proposition*, and let us apply it to the formation of



effective check, if caprice or wilfulness, or aught else unseemly, be manifested by the people, inasmuch as it belongs to them, agreeably to the word of God, to point out the necessary qualifications—to sit in judgment and pronounce sentence on the fitness of all candidates for the ministry—and, by refusing to ordain, if they see good cause, virtually to reject the person chosen, and so cancel his election. Thus, as has in substance been remarked, though the right of call to exercise official authority and oversight properly belongs to the Christian people, the right of conferring the actual warrant and power to exercise such authority and oversight properly belongs to the office-bearers of the Church who already possess it. The former, nominate or elect; the latter only, ordain.

Such appears to be the Scriptural view of this vital subject. And if so, for any secular or civil power, without warrant or authority from sacred writ, to claim or arrogate any title to intermeddle here, is plainly to interpose between the Head and the members—is plainly to do all that can be done, to sever the Lord Jesus from the Church which he has purchased at so inestimable a price, and bound to himself by the bands of an eternal love, and the incorporative infusion of an immortal life—is plainly to do all that finite impotence can achieve, to exhibit to a wondering universe the frightful anomaly of a head without a body, and a body without a head—a shepherd without sheep, and sheep without a shepherd—a bridegroom without a bride, and a bride without a bridegroom—a master without disciples, and disciples without a master—a ruler without subjects, and subjects without a ruler—a king without a kingdom, and a kingdom without a King!

In conclusion, the real nature and heinousness of all such interferences—whether with the sacred prerogatives of the great Head and King, or with the sacred rights and privileges of the subjects of his Kingdom and members of his Body,—may perhaps be more distinctly perceived by analogical reference to the more familiar affairs of men.

As regards the *rights*—the *unquestioned rights*—of a lawful *earthly sovereign*, would not the most insignificant attempt to prescribe laws, and enforce orders different from his own, and exercise authority and rule independent of his, be resented as a presumptuous aggression on his prerogative of sovereignty? How much more ought this to be felt in the case of Him, who reigns by a right that is absolute, and whose prerogative includes all power, legislative, judicial, and executive? Nor is it the *mere number* of old laws superseded and new ones prescribed—or the *degree* of rigor with which old orders are set aside, and new ones enforced—or the *extent* to which old rule and authority are

the pastoral tie—there is responsibility imposed both on the office-bearers and on the private members of the Church, by Christ himself, in the discharge of those functions which severally pertain to them. And the conclusion is—therefore, in the formation of the pastoral tie, both the office-bearers of the Church and the private members of every congregation, must be left free to serve the Lord Jesus Christ according to his word, and the dictates of their own conscience."

disregarded, and new rule and authority exercised—that constitutes the gist and acme of the real evil. No ; however small the number, minute the degree, or contracted the extent of interference, the real evil is, in there being any interference at all. It is the calling in question,—the violation—the repudiation—of the claims of exclusive sovereignty and rightful supremacy in any degree, that constitutes the insult, the indignity, the crime. When the territory of an independent monarch is invaded, and a portion of it forcibly seized,—it may be of small extent—it may be of intrinsically little value, or of no value at all. But what signifies that ? The integrity of the empire and the right of sovereignty are as injuriously affected by the forcible seizure of half an acre of barren waste, as by the forcible seizure of half a province of fertility and grandeur. In the former case as well as in the latter, the dignity of the crown is tarnished and the right of independent sovereignty impaired. And unless the insult be repelled,—the right vindicated,—a death blow has been struck at the supremacy of the sovereign. And if it be so, in reference to the kingdom of an earthly prince, how much more ought it to be so, in reference to the kingdom of Him, who is Prince of all the kings of the earth ? In this case, still more than in the other, it is not the mere number of old laws violated and new ones imposed—old orders slighted and new ones established ;—it is not the amount of old rule and authority despised and new rule and authority substituted instead ;—nor is it the mere extent or value of actual territory invaded and spoiled—that constitutes the real grievance. No ; the real grievance consists in the disgrace, the dishonour, the indignity offered to the independence and sovereignty of the great King and Head of the Church, by interference with his laws, his orders, his will, his authority, and his exclusive territory at all ! For, what does such officious and impious interference imply ? Is it not that he has been rudely driven from his own dearly purchased domain—ignominiously expelled from his own house—insolently cast down from his own throne—and violently robbed of his own kingly crown and most sacred honours ?

Again, as regards the *rights* and *privileges* of the free *subjects* of an earthly kingdom, would it be regarded as a light thing, whether they were called on to submit to the wise and beneficent statutes and regulations of their own lawful sovereign ; and to obey the magistrates and judges appointed by him agreeably to the usages and constitution of the realm ;—or, whether they were called on to submit to the fitful, capricious, and ill adapted commands of a usurping foreign power ; and submissively to obey the ill-qualified and ungainly functionaries forced by him on a reluctant and reclaiming people ? And is it to be endured that, in a case of immeasurably greater importance, this anarchical sort of dealing should be treated, as if it were a trifle light as air ? Is it to be tolerated, that the alternative should be regarded as a thing of nought,—whether the subjects of a wondrous kingdom of grace, that is soon to ripen into a still more wondrous kingdom of glory, are joyfully to submit to the royal statutes of their heavenly King, and profitably listen to his own chosen and accredited messen-

gers ;—or, whether they are to submit to the monstrous impositions of frail fallible earthly pretenders, and give heed to their violently intruded, time-serving, and despicable hirelings ? Tolerated !—did I say ?—What ! Tolerate a violation of the sovereign's prerogative ?—Then, tolerate treason ! tolerate rebellion ! Tolerate a surrender of the subjects' dearest rights and privileges ?—Then, tolerate infamy ! tolerate dishonour ! What ! Tolerate, by heartless concessions to the advocates of a carnal policy, the trampling under foot of the Redeemer's crown rights and inalienable prerogatives ? Tolerate, by conformity to the whisperings of a pitiful and ever shifting expediency, the robbery of the heaven-bestowed rights and liberties of his own free-born subjects, and sons, and heirs ? What ! Tolerate the arrogance—the ineffable effrontery—of such unrighteous and impious aggressions ? Tolerate the mean servility, the cowardly treachery, the base unfaithfulness, the treasonable disloyalty—of silence, or connivance, or tame submission to encroachments so heinous and so aggravated ? What ! Tolerate all this—and yet, call ourselves men—yea, Christians—yea, free-men of the Lord ? Tolerate death rather !—say we, than knowingly or willfully tolerate a bankruptcy of character so desperate—an inconsistency of conduct so foul, so egregious as this !

Oh then, let us be increasingly jealous for the honour, and increasingly zealous for the glory of our Great King. On his head are many crowns—the crown of dominion, over the kingdoms of creation, providence and grace—the crown of dominion, over all the hierarchies of heaven, the rulers of earth, and the potentates of hell—the crown of dominion, over the Church militant in travail, and the Church triumphant in glory. Let us awake and arise, and not suffer the lustre of any one of his royal crowns to be tarnished or eclipsed. Let us come forward now, and swearing fealty to Him, as our only spiritual Head and King, let us long and wrestle for the joyous day, when “the kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents ; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts ; yea, and all kings fall down before him ;”—and, casting their sceptres and diadems, and all other symbols of earthly royalty at his feet, shall unite in crowning him, Lord of all—rendering the heavens with the echoing song of “Alleluiah—Alleluiah—the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.”

Come, then, and, added to thy many crowns,  
Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,  
Thou who alone art worthy ! It was thine  
By ancient covenant, ere nature's birth ;  
And thou hast made it thine by purchase since,  
And overpaid its value by thy blood.  
Thy Saints proclaim thee King ; and in their hearts  
Thy title is engraven, with a pen  
Dipt in the fountain of eternal love.  
Thy Saints proclaim thee King ; and thy delay  
Gives courage to their foes, who, could they see  
The dawn of thy last advent, long desired,  
Would creep into the bowels of the hills  
And flee for safety to the falling rocks.”

## II.—CONVERSION OF THE JEWS.

[*The Mission to the Jews in Hungary and Palestine is one which excites the most lively interest in Scotland. The Collections made for it in the Free Churches in June last, more than doubled the preceding year's. And the Divine blessing will be seen, even from this one letter, to have descended in double showers on this field of our Church's labours. It is a rich token for good when God bestows on a whole Church an earnest desire to labour and to "pray for the peace of Jerusalem : for they shall prosper that love her."*]

LETTER from the Rev. ROBERT SMITH to the Rev. Dr. KEITH.

*Pesth, (Capital of Hungary) June 8, 1843.*

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—Knowing that the public mind in Scotland has, for the last few weeks, been intensely occupied by subjects of a domestic nature, I have delayed writing to you on the progress of the work here somewhat beyond the usual time. Now, however, that the great wave of excited feeling, which rolled over the land, must have passed away, the Jewish mission may again lift its head above the waters, and assume that prominent position in the view of the Free Presbyterian Church, which it is, I doubt not destined to occupy, connected, as it so eminently is, with her inward prosperity ; and also by bringing her into close contact with other Churches with her influence over the Christian world. Many events have taken place here since I last wrote, which call for renewed gratitude and thanksgiving. We have had, during this time, the unspeakable privilege of admitting Mr. Saphir, and the whole remaining members of his family (the eldest son having been previously received), into the Christian Church by baptism. This wonderful manifestation of the grace and love of God, by which salvation is literally come to a house, though surprising, and almost incredible to those who are of little faith, has not been an unexpected event ; for it is a remarkable fact, since prayer began to be offered for them, the request has ever been, not that this or the other, who seemed to be the most promising, should be led to Jesus, but that the whole family should be brought to acknowledge him as King of kings and Lord of lords. Such was the prayer of Dr. and Mrs. Duncan before they left,—such has been our prayer ever since. God is the hearer of prayer ; he has granted us according to our request. Only to show the *riches* of his grace in Christ Jesus, he has exceeded our prayers, according to his wont. We never prayed that the times of their conversions should be so near each other, as that they might be baptized together ; yet so has it happened. Here is an answer, and an overflowing answer to prayer. How guilty are all those who become acquainted with such a fact as this, and yet will not expect great things from God.

That you may become acquainted with the particulars of the baptism, I cannot do better than quote from my note-book :—"Yesterday were baptized Mr. Saphir, his wife, three daughters, and youngest son. All these, to the best of our discernment, have been made partakers of the grace of the Lord Jesus. His glorious name be praised. A whole family ! How seldom such a sight, even in the most Christian lands ! It is the Lord's doing, and wondrous in our eyes. On the morning of the baptism, the children were up between three and four, for prayer. The sound of

their sweet voices, at that early hour, gladdened and strengthened the parents' hearts. The father laid down, at his baptism, a solemn testimony, powerfully conceived and executed, not only to the truths of the gospel, but also to his own experience of them. Such a testimony has not been borne in Pesth to the truth of God for 200 years. He bore witness, also, to the change which he had with his own eyes seen on his wife and family,—pointing to them around him, and declaring the Spirit of God and the truth of God to have been the means of the moral transformation. Altogether, the sight was most affecting. A powerful impression was made. To hear of an inward struggle carried on between grace and sin, issuing, through the power of the Holy Ghost, in a new birth of the soul,—and that this, and not a mere change of profession, with a little knowledge of Christianity, was a true conversion from Judaism,—was something for which the hearers for the most part were quite unprepared. Yet there was a power, a simplicity, a truth, in the words of the patriarchal Jew, as he stood in the midst of his family and testified for him and for them what God had done for their souls, that showed, in the rivetted attention of all present, that these doctrines are no trifles,—that they cut deep, and enter into the very life of the soul. We spent the evening with the family. The joy, the peace, the love, among them, I shall not attempt to describe. It was the most lovely sight I ever beheld. Would to God some of the friends of Israel in Scotland had been present on that occasion! The zeal of the father kindling anew, and burning with more than usual brightness; perfect peace resting on the but lately care-worn countenance of the mother; the eldest daughter finding outlet to her thankfulness and joy only in tears; and little Adolph hanging on his beloved teachers, the very picture of a happy child! Such a scene was life to our souls. After praying with them, and exhorting them to continue stedfast in the faith, walking in the love and joy of the Spirit, and fellowship of the brethren, we left them, to assemble again next day for more special thanksgiving and praise.

"The servant of the family has been for some time in a very interesting frame of mind. She often weeps when Miss Saphir prays with her. Immediately after the baptism she came to me, and, evidently with her heart very full, expressed her longing to follow their example. I directed her to Jesus, exhorting her to make sure of an interest in him. In the evening, she seemed to look with wistful eyes upon the happy group around her. She spoke with us again, and was again directed to the Lord Jesus, as a present, free, and all-sufficient Saviour."

A few days later I find the following entry:—"Adolph visited the other day a Jewess of his acquaintance, who is also a neighbour. He spoke to her about her soul, of her state by nature, and need of salvation. She said, that all the neighbours marked a great change upon the Saphir family,—that they seemed now so happy. 'Yes,' said Adolph, 'we are happy, because we have got reconciliation with God, through the blood of his Son. We have peace in our conscience, and that makes us happy.' "The conversation ended in his engaging with her in prayer. His father and he seem to have exchanged with one another the characteristics belonging to their respective ages, or rather retaining the proper characteristics of youth and age—to have communicated the one to the other what more properly belongs to his own,—the child imparting to the father the simplicity of childhood—the father imparting to the child almost the maturity of age. One beautiful and touching illustration of this we have remarked in the conversations they have with each other, like brother with brother, on the Sabbath evenings, over the truths they have been hearing in the English service, in attending upon which they find great delight."

Since I last wrote, the young man Zerkovitz, has been with us during the

winter, and of whom I previously wrote as being in a very interesting state, has at length given satisfactory proofs of saving faith, and has been added to the Church. I believe that an over scrupulous fear of admitting without sufficient grounds, kept us from giving him the right hand of fellowship so soon as we ought to have done, and that this was the means of somewhat hurting the state of his soul. Our mistrust naturally caused him to mistrust himself, and damped his confidence before God. This view has been confirmed by the fact, that since the time of his being numbered among the brethren, he has been growing very rapidly in the divine life. The other young men spent with him the greater part of the night previous to his baptism in prayer, and enjoyed a very blessed season. He himself enjoyed much of the Lord's presence during the administration of the ordinance. After it, he said to me, "Now, I have lost all and found all." He had first found peace one afternoon during instruction, or in a private conversation afterwards. It was on a similar occasion Hautsch got the first believing sight of the gospel, which filled him with such overpowering joy, that, as he afterwards told us, his body almost sunk under it, and he could with difficulty walk along after he had left the house.

We have just learned that ——— of whom we formerly wrote, and who left this for Germany about two months ago, has been baptized. From the remarkable leadings of Providence in his case—from the state of his mind before his departure—from the high character, for Christian attainment, of those who have received him into the outward communion of the Church, and from letters which he has from time to time been writing to Pesth—we cannot but hope that he has found the Saviour.

Time would fail me were I to enumerate the various promising cases which we have at present on hand. One young man, of about 26 years of age, is with us, who heard of us about 400 miles off, and came the whole way to hear of Jesus. Another was brought among us for a few days by a remarkable providence, from a distant city, and I trust got that which may ultimately result in his saving conversion. He is of a remarkably sweet and gentle disposition, and must be very like the amiable young man who came to Jesus, of whom it is said, that he looked on him and loved him. He is anxious to find employment in a mercantile house in Pesth sufficient for his subsistence, and is willing (if he can obtain such) to leave his present excellent situation, and his relations, who are rich, that he may come and live near us. There are others, but I cannot mention them now. The influence of the work here has begun to be felt in a new and unexpected quarter. One of the Protestant clergymen of the place cannot find rest in his mind with his cold, heartless rationalism, and has actually set out upon a journey into Germany chiefly with the view of inquiring into the nature of this so called *mysticism*, and has, for this purpose, taken letters of introduction to some of the best and holiest men there to be found. Another, with whom we have had more intercourse, begins, we think, to be moved somewhat towards the truth. If these two men were called, what a blessing might it not be for this city! We trust the people of God at home will remember them specially in prayer.

The Church question in Scotland seems to be exciting more and more attention on the Continent. Even in the Vienna papers I saw a tolerably full account of the proceedings which took place at the opening of the Assembly. It was written evidently by a friendly hand. The energy, boldness, and stern conscientiousness of the evangelical ministers, meets with applause even where there is no spiritual discernment to see the importance of the principles for which they contend. It is an important fact, and one which may be turned to account, that the Church of Scotland has been looked upon on the Continent as the model of a Presbyterian Church, to approach

towards which is to approach towards perfection. This feeling, as I have lately learned, extends even to Hungary. I do trust the Free Church has sent, or will send soon, a deputation abroad. Nothing but sight will do to interest Churches in each other, and to draw each other into bonds of close fellowship.

*P.S.*—Dr. Duncan is not yet arrived. We wait for his arrival with much joy, and also with some measure of anxiety, in order that we may get our movements during the summer as speedily arranged as possible.

### III.—CORRESPONDENCE WITH FOREIGN CHURCHES.

*(From the Free Church Missionary Record for July, 1843)*

We particularly request the attention of our readers to the following communications from M. Boujour on the part of the Church of the Valleys of Piedmont, and from the celebrated D'Aubigné in name of the Société Evangélique of Geneva. Set up as "a spectacle to men and to angels," what more invigorating than the full stream of sympathy and Christian affection coming to our beloved Church from those who not only know what it is to believe in Jesus, but also to "suffer for his sake." How precious are such testimonies as we now have the privilege of presenting! and how loudly are we called upon to stand unwavering by our testimony, when honoured Churches, speaking through their most honoured men, greet us as with the words of holy and apostolic salutation. Let these memorials of brotherly-kindness be received with humility,—in the spirit of love which they breathe, and with much prayer for our own steadfastness, as well as blessings on those whom our God has made our comforters in the midst of tribulation.

**THE CHURCH OF THE VALLEYS to the CHURCH OF SCOTLAND\*.** Peace and joy be with you from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*The Valleys of Piedmont, March 27, 1843.*

**DEAR AND REVEREND BRETHREN,**—It is with lively joy, and profound gratitude to the Lord and to you, that we have received from Mr. Stewart the letter of sympathy (fraternisation) which your Church has been kindly pleased to address to us. Not that we have not been accustomed to count upon your interest in us, brethren well beloved of the Lord; for we have not forgotten what, in earlier days, the Lord has done by you on our behalf; and the individual acquaintance which we have had, more recently, with some of the members of your Church, was to us a guarantee that that interest continued always the same and that now, as in the days long gone by, the Church of the Valleys was to you dear and precious before God. But when your whole Church gave us assurance of her sympathy and affection, our hearts rejoiced exceedingly in the thought, that if the number of the

\* This it will be observed was previous to the disruption, and while yet the Established Church was controlled by the Evangelical majority whose councils these Foreign Bodies thus honour as those of the National Church. It is needless to add that their sympathies are now transferred to the same party in their new capacity of the Free Church of Scotland.—EDS. F. C.

enemies about us was becoming greater, that of our friends was far from becoming less. Accept, then, our thanks, dearly beloved brethren, for this new token of affection which the Lord has put it into your hearts to give us. You see that the trial, which by God's dispensation engages you, is not altogether *an evil*, since it has brought you to remember now, with greater tenderness and unanimity than in times past, those who suffer like you and contend for the same hope, which is in our Lord Jesus Christ. And independently of this fruit—not one of the least excellent which afflictions are designed to produce—do we not know, dear brethren, and has not history been written just to teach us, that of societies as of individuals it is true, that tribulation is the true crucible, which, by refining, perfects them, and makes them what God would have them to be? When is it that love is livelier, faith firmer, the songs of thanksgiving more significant, prayers more fervent, the heart and the eye more stedfastly turned to heaven, than when either a Church or an individual soul is sighing under the load of some great trial? Thus, dear brethren, while from the heart we sympathize in the trials which you endure, and pray that God may bring them to a conclusion, we are still confident, that in the end you will experience, that these years of visitation have been greatly more blessed to your Church than many long years of quiet and unbroken prosperity. And for ourselves, it is this reflection which has been our support and encouragement in the face of measures more and more rigorous, by which it is attempted, among us, to put the truth in chains. We have received much, and, indeed, we have been laden with blessings during these last years. Many precious seeds have been on cast our soil, and perhaps there is need of the rains of affliction, to make them take root and grow up to full maturity. At least, the sort of feelings called forth by the measures adopted in reference to us, have tended to the growth of the life of religion among us. Although this be yet feeble, still, from day to day, it advances and extends itself. We shall have to attend especially to the thorough organization of our schools the prosperity of which, thanks to the generous and indefatigable efforts of our benefactor, whose labour among us is doubtless known to you, increases daily. Meantime, we rejoice that the interest in the cause of missions, long extinct, has revived among us to an extent far beyond what we ventured to expect. Sabbath schools, attended as yet by as many and more adults than children, have been already set agoing in several of our districts, and give us reason to hope that a much larger number will, before long, be established. All things seem combining to bring in brighter days than for long we have seen. May it please the Lord who hath begun this good work to continue it, and more and more to perfect it! Entreat the Lord that it may be so, dearly beloved brethren. Pray for all the members of our Church, ministers and people, that we may daily live more as in His presence, doing all our works in love, and stedfastly looking to the author and finisher of our faith, Jesus Christ, who died for us, that those who live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him that died for them and rose again. May the Lord grant you, too, dear brethren, these graces, and all others of which you may stand in need! May He recompense you an hundred-fold for the love you have shown to us; and, above all, may He shed on your Church, in still increasing measure, His Holy Spirit, that having a good foundation, and being immovable in faith and love, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, you may become, indeed, a building of God through the Spirit, and the door of salvation for a multitude of souls! Thus does the Church of the Valleys salute you, and I, in its name,

To the Rev. DAVID WELSH, D.D.,  
Moderator, Edinburgh.

JN. JS. BOUJOUR, *Moderator.*



## LETTER from MERLE D'AUDIGNE to Dr. WELSH.

Geneva, May 29, 1843.

SIR, AND MUCH RESPECTED BROTHER,—I received, some time ago, your letter of December 1842, in which you acknowledge receipt of the letter of the Société Evangelique to the Church of Scotland; and now that the great event anticipated has occurred, I desire to take your hand, and in yours, that of all your brethren, and to say to you—Let your beginning be in the name of the Lord! I was doubtful whether I should not go to Scotland for the occasion, as I had been requested to visit England. But I have been somewhat consoled by the consideration, that as I should have had to be in London on the 17th, it would have been impossible for me to be in Edinburgh on the 18th. How happy should I have been, my dear brother, to have taken my place in the rear of that procession, at the head of which you walked. Indeed, as Dr. Gordon has said, you had no alternative; for it was a matter of conscience. You have not hesitated to choose between God and the world; and, like Moses, you have esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, because you have had respect to the recompense of the reward. Now you will fear neither the wrath of the king, nor the wrath of the people; and you will endure, as seeing him who is invisible. Your outgoing has been a triumph; but it will not always be so; (and I feel that I ought to say it) I hope it will not always be so; for every work which is verily of God must be baptized with the baptism of humility—of reproach—of pain—of tears. As individuals, and as a Church, you will have your moments of grief; and, perhaps, then some one will say, Was the separation indeed according to God's will? But no—Your brethren, sons of the stranger, seeing the great applause with which, in crowded assemblies, the speeches of your orators were responded to, have been led sometimes to ask themselves with uneasiness—Is this in truth the work of God? But when they see your Church abased, “having no form or comeliness, despised and rejected of men,” then—then every doubt will be dispelled, and by her likeness to the Bridegroom will they recognise the bride. I have read with much pleasure what Dr. Chalmers said upon this subject: “Never forget the deep humility which holy men of old mixed up with their joy” . . . “They must not seek for freedom in the applause of the multitude.” Let them be prepared with like sacrifices . . . the loss of popularity, themselves, their families, their all.” Yes! these are words of truth; and let us march under this banner, and we shall conquer the world.

I believe that on the fundamental question we should be pretty much as one. I think, indeed, that those of our friends who deny *absolutely* the lawfulness of union between Church and State, perhaps go too far. The State may be conceived to be in such a healthy condition (Christian), that the Church runs no risk in being united with it. When in Germany, at the era of the Reformation, the prince said, “Rather than abandon the confession of this doctrine, I would abandon the throne of my fathers, I would take my staff, and go to bear the shoes of strangers,” then might the Church without fear unite itself to the State. But the nineteenth century is not the sixteenth. The State is no longer guided by Christian principles; it is now nothing but a *society for temporal interests*. I can understand that a Church dead and earthly may be in union with a State, the maxims and government of which are foreign to the life to God. Then it is but the *dead* walking with the dead; they will walk as those who are agreed. But from the moment that a Church becomes *alive*, how is the union to continue? It would be to wish, like French Revolutionists, to unite a living man with a

corpse. While the Moderate or dead party has borne sway in your Church, the union has been possible. From the moment that life from Heaven revived your Church, there has been disagreement, and the union has been necessarily dissolved. I can understand that an union might be maintained where the State does nothing but *endow*; but then I have never seen a statesman, even a Christian statesman, who consented to that. "If we endow," they say, "we ought to govern." Moreover, as Dr. Chalmers says, "connection with the State is a great temptation to sin;" of this we see on the Continent, every day, the most lamentable proofs. Yet I can conceive this system to work in Scotland, where the majority of the ministers are orthodox. But when, on the Continent, we see the great majority of the ministers of the National Churches (at least in many countries) to be Rationalists, Unitarians, and when we ask ourselves why it is so, the answer must be,—Because they are paid by State endowments. Were Government to withdraw its support, they would all give way; there would not be three per cent. who would find people to maintain them,—while Christians would combine to plant Christian ministers in every place.

Your separation, my dear brother, is a momentous event. May God make it a blessing to the whole Church! Yesterday (Sabbath), I sent to the chaplain at the church of the Oratoire, the following paper, which was read at the principal service:—"The Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, having just completed its separation from the State, and formed itself into a General Assembly under the presidency of Dr. Chalmers,—that Church, its ministers, and people, are earnestly recommended to the blessing of the Lord, and to the prayers of this assembly." In terms of this notice, there was added to the last (liturgical) prayer, a fervent prayer (extempore) that God would grant you grace to build yourselves upon Christ, the true Rock, and keep yourselves immovable under your only Head.\* \* \* \* \*, who was present, told me, at parting, that she had been much moved. Adieu, Sir, and dear brother.

Be so good as salute, in my name, Dr. Patrick M'Farlane and Mr. Stewart (returned from Malta); and believe me always your attached friend and brother,

(Signed)

MERLE D'AUBIGNE.

*(From the Free Church Missionary Record for August, 1843.)*

We inserted last month two Christian epistles, unfolding the full and decided expression of interest, on the part of the Church of the Valleys, and the Société Evangélique of Geneva. We now present two similar communications from the clergy of Schaffhausen and the ministers of Basle. Such solemn documents are peculiarly valuable, and fitted to awaken important and profitable reflection. We know not what the undisclosed future may reveal as the issue of our testimony; but to find ourselves in Christian and brotherly union with the excellent of the earth, we may surely accept as a token for good, and may warrantably account a ground of humiliation, as well as of gratitude,—because, although most unworthy in ourselves, and laden with the guilt of innumerable backslidings, God is giving us favour in the eyes of his own people.

**THE CLERGY of the CANTON of SCHAFFHAUSEN in SWITZERLAND, to the  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY of SCOTLAND.**

*Schaffhausen, May 4, 1843\*.*

DEAR BRETHREN IN THE LORD,—Grace be with you, and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.—Though, by various causes, your brethren at Schaffhausen have been prevented from answering your letter from the 30th of May 1842, they have resolved, at this day, to send you back a token of Christian fellowship, thinking that it is better to answer at a late time than never; and they beg your pardon on account of this delay.

The Church of Christ being but one body, all of its members, according to St. Paul, rejoice when one rejoices, and suffer when one is suffering. Your dear letter is able to produce both feelings in the hearts of Christian readers. The blessing which God has laid upon your labour of love among Jews and Heathen, awakes a lively sense of gratitude toward the Giver of all good, and raises the heart above the sorrows felt at the viewing of so many examples of apostacy from the true living God, and his beloved Son, among the Christian,—nay, among our Protestant Churches. But the history of your present struggles, which, as we learn, grow more serious from day to day, afflicts our hearts, and we feel ourselves pressed to declare before you our deep sympathy with your present situation. As for entering into the matter itself, we are standing too far from your country and your ecclesiastical institutions, to be able to do that. The relations between Church and State in our country have taken another direction than in yours, since the days of the blessed Reformation, the governments of the Protestant cantons of our country having ranged themselves amongst the first promoters of reformation, which has given them an influence in ecclesiastical affairs, which has not always been a salutary one. Yet, considering the power of this historical right, considering that the Lord never gave distinct precepts on this matter,—that, furthermore, he is and will be the only Head of his Church,—we as little recognise any human headship as you, and that not so much the form of government, as the character of the governing persons advances or hinders the welfare of the Church, the Protestant clergy of our country will suffer this imperfect state of church-government, as long as the Word of God is not bound. But in your richly blessed country, dear brethren, the matter is a different one, as for the historical right; and should we now give you the advice, not to hold fast what you have? No, brethren; by this manner we shamefully would endeavour to betray your precious rights and privileges, which you have exposed before the Protestant world in your memorandum. But allow us to pray the Lord, that it may please Him to guide you in this perplexed affair, and to give you willingness to let yourselves be guided alone by Him, through the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, of knowledge and holy fear, of strength and love and sober mind, aiming, in all things, the real welfare of His flock. May this affair, whatever may be its end, turn out to the advancement of His kingdom. Should you, even in outward affairs and institutions, experience many unfavourable changements, which your zeal and prudence will prevent, we hope the great work of salvation of immortal souls will not be hindered as long as you will continue to preach the Word in the Holy Spirit, and purely and faithfully administer the holy sacraments.—With this hope and earnest wish, we have the honour, dearly beloved brethren, to subscribe

ourselves, your faithful brethren in Christ, the members of the Protestant clergy of Schaffhausen, in whose name,

The Antistes, D. SPLEISS.  
The Secretary, C. HOKAR.

*Beselden, Murch 24, 1843.*

REVEREND AND BELOVED BRETHREN,—However deplorable the circumstances are which have induced you to enter with us into correspondence, we rejoice heartily that a communication has been established by it, which can be so important and efficacious for awakening and reviving mutual sympathy.

The trials and visitations which our Lord has awarded upon His Church, have been from the first beginning one of the most effectual means for propagating the gospel, and awakening love and sympathy amongst her members. And we have thus reason to boast of the afflictions, and to praise the Lord, whom it pleases to turn the most sorrowful trials of those who have preserved his covenant and commandments into blessings.

However plain and concise the exposition of your difficulties is, yet our circumstances and organizations are too different from yours, than that we could venture to enter into a minute discussion of the latter, or to assist you with our advices.

In our country, the clergymen are remunerated by the Government. The election of them, however, depends entirely upon the elders of the parish, in connection with the Government and the spiritual court. All the clergymen who have received holy orders are eligible for the vacant places without requiring to make any personal application for that purpose.

If a clergyman receives, at the first voting, two-thirds of votes, he is without further steps elected; should, however, none of them receive so many votes, lot decides between those two who have the highest number of votes and an absolute majority. Only at the election of the Antist certain modifications take place. We admit that such a kind of election is not everywhere applicable, and that it may give occasion to many machinations and agitations of party spirit; but this, thanks to kind Providence, has not been hitherto the case with us. At the elections there reigns a calm and solemn disposition. The idea of having been called to his office by the confidence of the congregation, must be in all future occasions very encouraging and satisfactory. It appeared to us, that this mode of election is most agreeable to the spirit of Christianity, and in conformity with the example of the primitive congregation; yet we believe that the Land of the Lord may be effectual by elections which are undertaken on quite different principles, and that in every case the words of the Lord, spoken through the mouth of the Prophet Isaiah, are fulfilled, (xli. 27) "I will give to Jerusalem one that bringeth good tidings."

However heavy the trials may be which at present agitate your Church, it cannot be entirely unknown to you, that our Basle Church, in the past ten years, has experienced far heavier afflictions. Twenty-eight parishes have been torn away by a violent revolution from our union; twenty-seven ministers were suspended by the new rulers, and that mostly against the will of the parishes concerned. It was done certainly not for that reason only, that the ministers detested the revolutions, but chiefly also because they preached the pure gospel, which the new leaders believed not to be need of.

But it proved soon that the pure Word of God is indispensable to the administration of external peace and order. The unworthy teachers which have accepted the places of the dismissed, are already, for the most part, replaced through faithful believers of truth, of whom the half belonged to

our Basle ministry. But still the Canton Basle country needs all church organization, so much so, that even an organ is not to be found, through which we could officially communicate your letter to the ministers of the new Canton district.

In so sad occurrences we could do nothing else than to humble ourselves under the mysterious will of the Highest, and to believe that He knows best how to carry on His work of grace in the midst of all tribulations. It has also shown itself, that already many souls who have been without wholesome food for a length of time, have come to the right consciousness of the blessings which the pure and sincere confession of the gospel secures to a country.

For the town and the two country parishes which have remained in connection with the town, the time of humiliation has been of great benefit. The promulgation of the commandments of God to our happiness has been continued with blessing; and the different Christian institutions in our town, particularly the missionary society, enjoy a continual extension. The missionary society is not considered with us as with you, a business of the Church. We believe, that by the direction of the Lord, many various arrangements may be led to an end equally blessed; but there exists between the Church and the missionary society, the most friendly relation. Many of our first clergymen are members of the missionary committee. The inspector of the mission-house is at the same time professor of theology in our university; and the pupils who prepare themselves for the service of the heathen world, attend partly also the public lectures.

We feel ourselves highly gratified by the fact, that since the blessed days of the Reformation, the pure doctrine of the gospel has had in our country an uninterrupted succession of faithful believers; but certainly should our thanks for this great favour animate more fervent our belief, and our love should be more ardent for Him who has loved us unto death.

Assuring you of our sincere sympathy and mediation in regard to your circumstances, we avail ourselves of this occasion to recommend ourselves to your remembrance and brotherly love, that the commandments of the Lord should more abundantly dwell among us than hitherto, and that the name of Jesus Christ the crucified, should be praised by preachers and hearers.—In the name of all the members of the Basle ministry, we wish you grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Signed by the Antistes and Secretary.

#### IV.—THE MANSE FLITTIN'.

(Communicated.)

*John*—Oh Leczy, I've seen a sicht the day I'll no forget.

*Leezy*—Hoot, John, ye're aye seein farlies, what hae ye been seein noo? Has a white hare run across ye'er road? But Dear Gudeman what *is* the matter wi' ye? I see there's something far wrang.

*John*—Ye may wèel say that. Ma hairt was na sa snir when ma bra' Jamie was laid i' the mools. I've joost seen the manse flittin'.

*Leezy*—Oh John little did I think that you and me wad ever leeve to see sae black a day. Foul fa' them that's driven them frae their hoose and ha; it's a wae day for the parish that sees their backs turned and the dust shaken aff their feet.

*John*—I could lie doon and greet when I think o't. When Jamie was taen awa frae us it was a sair dispensation, but it was the doin' of God, and we kened that He buid hae gude raisons for't, an' then as lang's we had the minister I aye kened we had aye that wad beer the heavy end of the ladder, but noo he's taen frae us our ain backs man dree a' our burdens, our ain dams man kep a' the spait.

*Leezy*—Hoot John man ye man compose yeersell. Ye ken the cluds are ne'er sae thlick but a glent a sunshine gets through belyve; an' ought we no raither to be thankfu' to the mercy that has spared him sae lang amang us than repine at the providence that has ta'en him noo awa. What wad it hae been if he had been ta'en awa frae us afore we kened the blessed gospel that he has preached till us, afore we had a heavenly frien far abler nor him to beer no the heavy en' o' the ladder only, but to beer the burden o' a' our cares and sorrows even as he bare our sins in his ain body on the tree.

*John*—Weel a wat that's true; but may we no richtfully grieve when sae gude a human frien is ta'en awa frae us. Ye ken Leezy he has been our frien for weel nigh thirty years. For ten o' thae we ill requited his friendship but first you and then me were laid hold on by the poor o' the gospel that he preached to us, or I sud say by the poor o' the Spirit of a' grace, an' ever sin that time has he no been to us mair like a faither than any thing else, though I'm an aulder man nor him. Has he no been o'ur thae cauld muirs fair day and fool. hoo often has he knelt on that flag flure, how often has he read to us the Word of God and told us o' things that we could hardly tak in then but which we noo ken to be the truth o' the livin' God. An' wad ye hae us no be grieved when his shadow's nae mair to darken our door and the voice o' his salutation nae mair to be heard in our dwellin'?

*Leezy*—Oh John, far be't frae me to bid ye no grieve. • He that sees the hairt only kens hoo sair I grieve mysell. Wad we no be waur nor the senseless lambs that bleat sac sair when they're spained frae their mithers, if we was na to grieve when he's ta'en frae us that has for sae mony a lang year dealt out to us the word o' life, gi'en us aye a portion in saison as God laid to his hauns.

*John*—I wad hae thocht naething o' his bein turned out o' the Kirk—that was the duin of Englishmen that ken naething o' the feelins o' Scots folks' hairts; but our ain laird that has been aye o' his ain hearers a' his days to refuse him and us a bit o' lan' to build a kirk for the worship o' God and a' hoos to beild the heads of his ministerin servant and his family! I wad na hae believ't it possible if ony body had told me ten days bygone.

*Leezy*—He'll rue the day ere lang. Trouble has been in his hoos and trouble wull be in't agane; and when he's veesited wi sair hairt-sorrow, he'll ken what a blessin he has thrown awa' this mornin'. But John—are ye suir after a' that they're rarely gane?

*John*—I'm o'ur suir o' that. I was workin on the road at the back o' the Manse, and I saw the Mistress come oot and tak the road doon to the Kirk and I gaed thro' a slap i' the hedge no to hae to speek till her, for I kened it wad be far better joost to let her grief tak its ain bent, and sae I gaed o'er the hedge as I was sayin' and lay down till she gaed by, and ma hairt was like to loup when I saw her, and thocht it was may be the last time—and suir am I there's no a hairt i' the parish that winna wail for her, for she was like a mother to us a', and mair nor ony mother to mony a aye. Sae she gaed doon to the Kirk-yard and she stayed a lang time ayont the Kirk, when her ain son and dochter lie, and I was glad she was ahint the Kirk, for if she had been on the same side as me I could neither hae lookit at her nor lookit frae her, and at last she cam back and she gaed nearly back to the manse up to the tap o' the brae, and then she lookit doon to the toon, and

then she sat down on the big stane and she grat till I thoct her hairt wad burst. And then the Minister himsell cam till her and I thoct he lookit just as he wad do if he was gaun to the poopit, only he seemed to step firmer, and I thoct that aither he was tryin' to keep up *her* speerits or else that he had been raised abune himsell by communicin' wi his heavenly Father, and they gaed the twa o' them back to the Kirk-yard, and I saw them look at mony a headstane, and our Jamie's amang the lave ; then they gaed roun the Kirk thegither, and wha kens a' they thoct and a' they felt when they sat down on the thrugh-stane that covers their bouny bairns. Then they cam slowly back and lockit the manse door and gied the key to the Laird's flunky that had come o'er to get it, and then they gaed awa' and I lookit after them as lang's I could see them, and then I sat down and grat like a bairn, and then I fan' that I could na work nae mair the day, and sae I cam awa' hame.

*Leezy*—Oh wae's me, wae's me ! if the prophet says how beautiful on the hills are the feet o' them that preach the gospel, I think the feet o' him or raither I should say o' them (for her life was like a sermon) the feet o' them that had sae long preached the gospel till us and are noo driven awa like vagabones frae the parish buid leave a curse as they gaed down the hill, and I wad na like to be in his shoen that comes up it to open the Kirk-door that's been barred against him.

*John*—Oh *Leezy*, ye suld na speak that gate. We man forgie if we houp to be forgien. But praised be God yonder's the holy man himsell comin' to leave his blessin' wi' us.

*Leezy*—God be thanked indeed—but I canna stan' the meetin'. Ma hairt's o'ur sair.

"*Mr. P.*—Well John how's a' wi' ye to-day ? Nothing wrong I hope ? but it's rather unusual to see you at home at this time o' the day."

*John*—Deed sir ye may weel say it's unusual. Fair day and fool, I dinna aften miss ma' darg—but I've o'er heavy a hairt to work the day. There's mony a toom haun and mony a sair hairt i' the parish the day by mine—God's readin' us a sair *laisson* the day sir, and sall we no sit still and listen till Him when He speaks in his providence ?

*Mr. P.*—It is well John that we should learn from all the providential dealings of God to love him more and to trust him more, and then he will make all things work together for our good. But I come to bring you news that you don't expect to hear.

*John*—The warst blow's struck sir, they canna be waur nor I expect.

*Mr. P.*—But they may be better John. What would ye say if Mr. Widecrofts had consented after all to give a stance for a Church ?

*John*—What wad I say ? I wad thank God the giver o' a' gude gifts the langest day I had to leeve. But it's no possible after the positiv refusal he gied to the letter o' the parishioners.

*Mr. P.*—Mind John who it is that holds the hearts of men in his hands and turneth them as he doth the rivers of water. He has softened Mr. Widecroft's heart, and he has now given a stance ; so do you think the adherents o' the Free Kirk will be able to get up a building ?

*John*—Able ? They wad build the tower o' Bauble ; and a' far o'er little. But are ye suir it's true sir ? Weel, they say if there's as muckle blue i' the lift i' the morning as the breedth o' a herd's plaid it will be a fair day. But weel a wait when I saw the Mistress and you gang down the brae this mornin' I thoct the hale sky was o'ureusten and that there wad ne'er be joy or gladness in the parish again. *Leezy*, *Leezy*—come and tak fareweel o' the Minister—ha ! ha ! tak fareweel o' the ae o' parlement Minister and bid walcum to the free Kirk Minister. What are ye sittin greetin' for ? We've lost naething but the steepins ; and muckle luck may they do him that gets

them. Come awa' Sir, and shew us whar the stance is, and I'll haw the foon masell. I'll begin o'er I sleep. Oh that na' bra' young Jamie was here to see the day. He wad hae had a glad hairt, for weel weel he likit ye sir : and muckle cause had he. He wad hae baith helpit to haw the foon and big the wa's, for shool and truam cam baith alike to him. The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord.

## V.—HOME INTELLIGENCE AND MISCELLANEOUS SELECTIONS.

### I.—GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S ADDRESS TO MINISTERS ABROAD.

*Edinburgh, June 28, 1843.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—We have been requested by the Committee of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland on Colonial Missions, in conformity with the deliverance of the Assembly on the 29th May, to open a communication with you in regard to the present position of our Church, and to inform you as to our views and purposes respecting our countrymen in the British Colonies, and in foreign lands.

You are already fully acquainted with the views of the different parties in the Church of Scotland as it existed previous to the month of May last, and in particular with the principles which were maintained by those who have recently seceded from the Establishment, not merely from the ordinary channels of public information, but also from the documents which from time to time were transmitted to you. It having appeared to us that there was an invasion of our rights and privileges by the Civil Courts, an appeal was made to Her Majesty's Executive Government, and thereafter to the Legislature of the country. The result of this appeal was unfavourable to the claims of the Church, and it was found by the individuals holding our views, that a Free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in accordance with the fundamental principles of that Church, as heretofore understood, could not be constituted without a violation of the terms of the Union between the Church and the State, as declared by the highest authority. In these circumstances, after much deliberation and earnest prayer, the Commissioners to the Assembly, maintaining the principles for which the Church has been for some time past called upon to contend, resolved to enter their solemn protest that a Free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, as established by law, could not be holden, and to withdraw from the meeting.

The circumstances connected with this solemn proceeding, and the reasons by which we were actuated, are set forth fully in the accompanying paper, entitled "The Affectionate Representation," &c., to which we must refer you for further information.

It affords us great pleasure to be able to inform you, that amidst the many trials and privations to which we have been already subjected, and to which we have the prospect of being still further exposed, it has pleased the Great Head of the Church to visit and support us with many and great encouragements. Our meetings were distinguished by a spirit of grace and supplications, and great unanimity. The zeal of the people of Scotland also, in the cause of the Free Church, has been manifested to an almost unprecedented degree, and a great door and effectual has been opened up for preaching the gospel. Nor are the benefits likely to be confined to our own



country. The spirit of liberality which has been awakened, encourages us to hope, that, under the divine blessing, the Church will be enabled to carry on her missionary operations with greater energy and to a greater extent than heretofore.

We can truly assure you, that the condition of our countrymen, whether in the Colonies or in foreign kingdoms, has attracted the most anxious consideration of the Church. You may well believe, from the practical proof we have given of the importance we attach to our principles, that we are most anxious that they should be generally recognised; and in one especial manner we conceive it to be of the utmost importance to the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom, that the Scottish Presbyterians who are scattered over every quarter of the world should proclaim their attachment to them; and at one time we had contemplated a lengthened address to our ministers and people generally in other lands, explaining fully the doctrines in regard to the kingly character of Christ which we maintain, and urging to an adherence to them. Upon further consideration, however, a different course has suggested itself to us; and having all confidence in the wisdom and Christian principle of the court over which you preside, we think it better to place the subject in your own hands, leaving it for the \* \* \* to consider what, in all the circumstances, the course is, which it is their duty to pursue, as a Church, and as individuals, and in what manner they should bring the question under the view of their people.

In what manner the resolution to which you may come is likely to affect your temporal interests, we are unable to judge. We are satisfied, however, that you will follow what appears to you to be the path of duty, wherever it may lead. And we beg to assure you, that if in any instance the claims of conscience cannot be yielded to without suffering loss, our sympathies and active exertions, as well as those of our people, will be called forth to meet the evil, in so far as we are able.

It may be proper to state, before concluding, that the Committee is already prepared to continue operations in sending out ministers to destitute localities, and they are ready to receive applications upon the subject.

We shall trust to your laying this communication before your \* \* \* with as little delay as possible, and we shall be glad to be acquainted with the result of your deliberations in regard to it. And hoping for an interest in your sympathy and prayers, and assuring you of our having you continually upon our hearts at a throne of grace,—We remain, &c.

(Signed)      DAVID WELSH, } *Joint Conveners.*  
                    JOHN SYM, }

## 2.—EDUCATIONAL MEASURES OF THE FREE CHURCH.

(*From the Free Church Missionary Record for July 1843.*)

The evidence is daily accumulating upon the Educational Committee, that the great principles for which upwards of 470 of the ministers of the Church have sacrificed their personal interests, and fondest prepossessions, are maintained, with the same earnest and self-sacrificing spirit, by a large portion of the schoolmasters connected with the old Establishment. These, whether occupying the position of Parochial or Assembly teachers, will speedily be subjected to the same trials as the ministers have passed through. No other prospect lies before them but rejection from their present

charges—the sacrifice of the entire emoluments of their office. These faithful men are fairly and fearlessly contemplating this issue. One parochial schoolmaster writes,—“Till within the last few days, I was under the impression that I would only have to sign the Confession of Faith at my induction. This, of course, I was prepared to do; but I find that the same statute that imposes subscription to the Confession of Faith, imposes also subscription to the formula of the Church of Scotland as established by law. This I cannot do, and will not do, by the help of God. I am accordingly contemplating the resignation of my appointment. I feel it exceedingly hard, thus to be obliged to give up to a *moderate* successor, a situation worth at the least £120, and it is all the harder that I have no prospect of any other, and at the same time without money, and without a home, or friends. God knows what is in prospect for me,—I know not. Let me, amidst these difficulties, have the benefit of your prayers.’ Pray that I may have grace given me to be faithful, and to hold out for the cause of Christ, notwithstanding the allurements of the world. If I know myself, my daily request at the throne of grace is, that, through the grace that is in Christ, I may be enabled to devote myself, soul, and body, and spirit, to His service.” Another writes,—“I must put myself at the disposal of the Committee on Education, in the event of being ejected, as I may very soon be, because I shall go out very poor, and have a wife and young family, and an aged relation dependent on me. I think I could usefully combine the offices of teacher and catechist if desirable, having had many years practice in conducting a Sabbath school, which — (the late minister) organized soon after I came to the parish, sixteen years ago, and left almost entirely to me soon after. In any way I could be useful, I would devote myself to the service of the Free Church, and be contented with a situation of any kind, that would at all enable me to support my family.”

Already the work of ejection has begun. Teachers, for promptly and frankly intimating their adherence to the Free Church, have, with much dispatch, and little courtesy, been informed that their services are henceforth dispensed with. In other cases, the petty torturing appliances that precede ejection have begun, and hints and intimations been given of what will inevitably follow absence from the parish church. A minister writes,—“A teacher of one of the — schools in a neighbouring parish, has called upon me, wishing to know how he is to act in present circumstances. He is an adherent to our Protestant Church, and being situated in a parish, the minister of which does not quit the Establishment, he does not now attend his ministrations. In consequence of this, he has had it intimated to him, from certain quarters, that he must quit his school. Most of the families, whose children are educated by him, are also adherents to our Church.”

“Another — school teacher, in another neighbouring Moderate parish, tells me, that it has been hinted to him, that if the receiving of his salary depends on a certificate from the parish minister, he will not get it.”

In these circumstances, what is to be done? A large, and that the most conscientious, and we are confident the most highly qualified and talented portion of the teachers of Scotland will be set adrift from their houses—separated from their honourable and useful labours, and subjected with their families to the severest privations. They are prepared for this. They are ready to endure it for conscience sake. But ought the Christian community to remain an idle spectator of their suffering heroism? The sympathy and aid we owe to Christian brethren in suffering forbids this,—if one member suffers all the members should suffer. But specially the interests of our Scottish families, and our hope of an extended and efficient Christian education for their rising members, forbid it. It is one of the circumstances in her heaven directed course, for which the Free Church has

reason of thanksgiving, that a large body of godly and eminently qualified teachers should have cast in their lot with her, and, in doing so, have necessarily placed themselves, at the same time, at her disposal. We do not regret we are forced to entertain the question, What is to be done with these men? It is one of the happiest circumstances in our lot that we *must* entertain it, and that immediately,—that the cause of Education must be taken up, and on a large scale, contemporaneously with the birth of the Free Church. Let the following extract show the spirit that animates at least, some of the teachers cleaving to the old Establishment:—"I am anxious to bring before you the situation of this parish in regard to a schoolmaster. Our present teacher has taken a most active (I may say malignant) part in opposition to the principles for which the Church has of late been contending. Ever since the meeting of the Convocation, he has been attempting to poison the minds of the people and of the youth under his charge, by the circulation of Moderate pamphlets. As yet his efforts have not succeeded; my congregation have remained steadfast, and many of the parents express the utmost anxiety to have a school in connection with the Protestant Church of Scotland. There is already a house in a very eligible situation, which could be got at a rent of ———, and it is capable of accommodating upwards of 100 scholars; but we have no wealthy persons among us to provide a salary, and the people have been accustomed to very low school wages, so that we find it impossible to obtain a well qualified person to accept the situation. I do not know whether the Educational Committee have any funds to spare, but if they could grant £10 or £15, it would be an immense boon to this parish, as I feel assured that a respectable teacher would instantly secure the attendance of a great majority of the children." Would it be safe, would it be the duty of the Free Church, to leave her young members under such guides as here described? Granting that such a teacher is but a rare specimen of violent affection to the old Establishment, is it right to expose our children even to the hazard of such training? Is it consistent with our principles to leave them open to the infection of such instructions?

Let it be further considered, that the fact of the most conscientious of the parochial teachers throwing up their charges, inevitably casts a doubt upon the principles of those that remain behind.—a doubt sufficient to warrant our using the most energetic measures for placing the children of our Scottish families under teachers whose principles have been proved by trial, and come forth as gold seven times refined.

Let the members of the Free Church weigh these remarks, and prepare themselves straightway for the erection of a scholastic system throughout Scotland, that shall be co-extensive with the fold of the Free Church.

The following extract from the letter of a much respected correspondent, and one who spent many years of his life as a successful teacher, may afford useful hints to any of our friends projecting their church and school arrangements:—"It has occurred to me that, in the construction of churches for the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, it would be of great consequence, economically as well as morally, if (in the country at least) the manse and school-house should be united under one and the same roof, by placing them at opposite ends of the church. It is evident that in this way the expense of walls and roofing would be considerably diminished, while the moral efficiency would be greatly increased by the immediate vicinity of such colleges (may I call them) of instruction, both literary and Scriptural, thus united visibly, and, I trust, ever harmoniously together, under the superintendence of the minister, who, being always at hand, might, without fatigue, watch over the progress of the young, while the teacher was sowing that seed which was to come to greater maturity under Christ."

(From the *Free Church Missionary Record* for August.)

THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE have already entered upon their work with energy, and the Church and the country will be gratified by the following important appointments which have been already made.

#### APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSORS.

*Excerpt from Minute of the Education Committee of the Free Church of Scotland.*

July, 1843.

The meeting took into their consideration that part of the minute of the Acting Committee of date 4th July, relating to the appointment of Theological Professors to the New College; and in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Committee, and with thankfulness to God that they had it in their power to make appointments so eminently calculated for the efficient instruction and training of a succession of ministers of the everlasting gospel, the Committee nominated and appointed the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D., &c., to be Principal of the New College, and Primarius Professor of Divinity therein; the Rev. David Welsh, D.D., to be Professor of Divinity and Church History; and the Rev. William Cunningham, D.D., to be Professor of Divinity,—the special limits of his department to be afterwards arranged.

The Committee further agreed, in conformity with the recommendation of the Acting Committee, and agreeably to the wishes of Dr. Chalmers, to go through once more the full course of four years' lectures, which he has been accustomed to give as Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh; that he should commence with the students of the first year attending the Divinity Hall next session; and that Dr. Cunningham should enter on his duties with the session of 1844-45, taking in that session the students then entering to the Hall. The Committee, at the same time, deeply impressed with the great importance of having the theological instruction in the New College conducted according to the best principles, and after the most approved models, and assured that for accomplishing this, great benefit would be derived from a personal investigation, by an individual so peculiarly qualified for the important duty as Dr. Cunningham, into the constitution and working of some of the most eminent of the American Theological Institutions, unanimously resolved most earnestly to request that the Rev. Doctor would proceed for this purpose to America, whereby he would confer on this Committee and the Free Church, the highest obligation, and promote in a very great degree, they feel assured, the character of the New College, and the cause of religious instruction in this country.

With regard to the exact time of Dr. Cunningham's departure, it was left to the Rev. Doctor to make such arrangements as were most suitable to himself, and, in the hope that a colleague might be provided for him in connection with another object relating to the interests of the Free Church, it was agreed to communicate the resolution as to Dr. Cunningham's visit to America to the Ingathering Committee.

### 3.—REVIVAL OF RELIGION IN THE ISLE OF SKYE.

(From the *Free Church Missionary Record* for July.)

The Rev. Mr. Macleod of Snizort thus writes to your Committee:—  
“Mr. Norman Macleod was appointed to the station at Unish in May 1839,

and opened school there on the 15th of June following. In April 1840, a few individuals appeared to be awakened to a sense of their lost condition by nature. Towards the end of August of the same year, there seemed to be an unusual concern among the people relative to their spiritual interests; and many cried out at the meetings in apparent distress of mind. The effect of these impressions continued in an increased attention to the things that belong to their peace. Symptoms of declension, however, began to appear; and the period for the teacher's removal drawing near, he felt his spirit unusually moved regarding their state. Under these circumstances he met with his scholars on the morning of the 15th of May last, being the Lord's day, and the last day of the session, and experienced much tenderness of feeling towards them, and observed strong indications of the same among them. About two o'clock in the afternoon he met with the people for worship, when an individual cried out. They met again at night, when he read the 11th chapter of Mark, and made some remarks on the parable of the barren fig-tree, and in conclusion adverted to his three years' residence with them, and asked, now that he was about to leave them, what fruit they had brought forth. On his asking that, the most extraordinary emotions appeared among the people; some wept, and some cried aloud as if pricked in their hearts, while others fainted, and fell down as if struck dead. In this state they continued together the whole night; and instead of the teacher's going away on the morrow, as he had previously intended, such was the awakening that he remained for sixteen days, reading and praying,—the people continuing to assemble with so little intermission, day or night, that he could only get about two hours' sleep early every morning. This state of things at Unish, as may be readily conceived, soon began to be noised abroad; and the consequence was, that numbers from various parts of the country were attracted to the scene, many of whom became similarly affected with the rest. It was now judged necessary that the people should have regular preaching, and the immediate vicinity of the village of Stein was the place fixed upon for preaching. The minister of a neighbouring parish, who had been applied to, accordingly went on the day preceding that appointed, and was not a little surprised, on coming in sight of the place, at seeing a dense body of people sitting down as if hearing the word. He proceeded to the spot, and found a friend of the cause, an elder of the Church, addressing the congregation,—and on his concluding, he gave a short address himself, and dismissed them with an intimation, that there would be sermon next day. It appeared that a report had gone abroad that that was the day appointed for the preaching. Next day the crowd was much greater,—the appearance of the congregation, and the impressions on many most striking. At the conclusion, sermon was again intimated for that day week; and when that day came, the crowd was immense, no fewer than 60 boats being hauled up on the beach that had come from various parts of the coast opposite and around. The impression on the hearers still deepened; and sermon was again intimated for the following day. On that day the wind was high, and it was thought that boats would not venture out; yet many did come; but such was the difficulty they encountered, that it gave rise to a suggestion for changing the preaching station, which was accordingly done, and a well-known spot, called Fairy-Bridge, where three roads now meet, was pitched upon as the most convenient place for meeting, and continued to be the scene of a weekly preaching to thousands for about two months, when the advance of the harvest season rendered it expedient to discontinue it. Multitudes from all parts of Skye, excepting the distant parishes of Strath and Sleat, flocked to Fairy-Bridge; and as a proof of one design of Providence at least, in permitting such outward manifestations as took place under the Word, it is a fact worthy of notice, that some who never went to hear the

gospel in their own parish, were induced, by what they heard was going on, to go many miles beyond to hear it there. Soon after the awakening broke out in Unish, it appeared also in Geary, another Gaelic school station in Waternish, under Mr. Murdoch Macdonald, the teacher there, and also at Glendale in the parish of Duirnish; so that from that extreme and intermediate point, where it first commenced, it proceeded to the right and to the left, till now, in a series of regular successive movements, it has traversed the whole extent of the island, from north to south, yea and beyond, even to the islands of Eigg and Rum, in the parish of Small Isles, the most distant bounds of the Presbytery of Skye. Such is a brief account of the commencement and progress of this most remarkable revival—a revival which, in the judgment of a competent witness (the Rev. Dr. Macdonald of Urquhart), who, in September last, made a preaching tour of the north of Skye, exceeds in intensity and extent any thing of the kind in the modern times."

"Most solemn, picturesque, and interesting it was to see the gathering!" Such is the language of one who has manifested the deepest interest in this work. "There were the young and the old, male and female, pouring forth from all sides of the land, from hills, and valleys, villages, hamlets, and from the lonely hut. The surrounding waters, too, were covered with about 50 skiffs, like the multitudes which dotted the sea of Tiberias, in pursuit of the Lord himself when he was manifested in the flesh. Like the going up of the Jewish tribes to the great feast at Jerusalem, was the going up of these anxious islanders to the gospel meeting at Fairy-Bridge. By the last accounts from those best qualified to judge, the result is stated to be, that there are few families in the whole island of Skye, containing a population of about 25,000 souls, where there has not been one or more individuals seriously impressed."

Here your Committee feel it to be their duty to notice an interesting circumstance connected with the progress of this work. It occurred to them, that as it had pleased God to bless the labours of your teachers at the commencement of the awakening, it might, by the same blessing, prove of vital importance to those who were awakened, that an additional supply of the same class of labourers should for a season be stationed among them, whose duty it should be to read, converse, and pray with the multitudes who were inquiring after the way of life. The reverend gentleman above referred to eagerly embraced this idea, and urged its adoption on your Committee. They felt its importance, and resolved to act on it, while, at the same time, they were pressed with the practical difficulty, that some of their best friends might possibly think that it was not in strict accordance with the fundamental rules of the Society, to devote any portion of their funds to the accomplishment of such an object, however important in itself. In these circumstances, your Committee were called to mark the hand of the Lord, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth, in the following interesting facts, communicated in a letter from Mr. Macleod, dated 4th October 1842:—"Since I wrote you, we have had various tokens of good from the Lord, both in providence and in grace. Of the former, one is very remarkable. Some friends in the south, of whom I am still ignorant, have placed £100 at my disposal, for forwarding the work of the Lord in Skye. Another friend has ordered the Greenock Bible Association to supply me with Bibles for the poor people, so that in that respect I need not be so chargeable to your Society," &c, &c. Your Committee felt, on receiving this interesting communication, that the gracious hand of Providence had interposed to remove the obstacle, and thus, without any charge on your resources, the plan above mentioned has, to some extent, been acted on, and your Committee have reason to believe, with eminent success.

#### 4.—EXTRACT FROM A PRIVATE LETTER DATED EDINBURGH, 28TH JULY 1843.

"I shall begin by telling you what it has pleased God to do for the congregation of the late Tolbooth Church, after leaving the old Cathedral of St. Giles, in which ever since the days of John Knox, that Church had been favored with an uninterrupted succession of pious ministers, who preached to them the gospel of the kingdom of Jesus Christ and salvation to the chief of sinners through faith in the atonement. The elders had made many fruitless endeavours to get a site in or near the parish, and at last had to assemble the Congregation in Freemason's Hall, Niddry Street, which was found much too small. Most providentially we got an offer from the managers of the Secession Church, formerly Dr. Paxton's in Infirmary Street, just beside Lady Yester's, and after some negotiation we concluded a purchase at the price of £2,350. It is a most comfortable, well-finished and well-seated Church, and holds about 1,200. Yet it is scarcely large enough, so many have adhered to the Free Church, and to Mr. Tweedie's ministry—who is an earnest pious Christian teacher, and a man of superior talents and clear simple views of the truth. We had the Lord's Supper dispensed on Sabbath last to about 740 communicants. The service was conducted in the most orderly manner, and a more than usual solemnity and devout feeling appeared to prevail.

I am decidedly of opinion that the disruption of the Church of Scotland will be productive of much good in Scotland, and that its influence will extend to England, and may by the blessing of God, be instrumental in checking the progress of Puseyism. The Hall at Canonmills which holds 3,000 people is filled three times every Sabbath, while the Churches of the Free Church in the town are crowded at the same time. There is a sad contrast in the Established Churches. In St. John's, where Mr. Guthrie used to preach to vast crowds, the collection now does not exceed 4s. 6d. at two meetings, or 2s. 3d. each time. The patronage both of private patrons and the crown appears to be bestowed on such ministers as were wavering or had *rattled* from their principles; Dr. Barr of Port-Glasgow, is to have the Church of Dr. P. McFarlane of Greenock; Mr. Jamieson of Currie, is to have St. Mary's Edinburgh, &c."

#### 5.—MISCELLANEOUS.

**PRAYER.**—"God does not need to be informed, or to be persuaded by us; he is *omniscient*, and knows what we need before we ask him; he is *all-merciful*, and is infinitely more ready to give than we to ask. We mistake the nature of prayer altogether, if we think that God is prevailed upon by it to do what otherwise he was averse to do \* \* \* The use of prayer is, to affect our own souls with a deep sense of our guilt and misery; to lead us to feel and acknowledge our entire dependence upon God; to raise our expectations from him; and to prepare our hearts for a grateful reception of his blessings; that when he has answered our petitions, we may give him the glory due unto his name. The very disposition to pray is a gift from

God; and God does not give *because* we pray, but stirs us up to pray, because he has before determined to give. This truth, well digested, preserves us equally from a *presumptuous neglect* of prayer, on one hand, and from a *superstitious use* of it, on the other.—*Rev. C. Simeon.*

**SELF-DENIAL.**—‘Even Christ pleased not himself.’ If any one who ever lived in this world, had a right to please himself, he surely had such a right—yet how far was he from claiming or exercising it! He evidently adopted and acted upon the principle, that, as man, he was not his own; that he belonged to God, and to the universe; and that he must do nothing merely for the sake of his own personal gratification. I contemplate this example with feelings similar to those with which a child, who has just begun to hold a pencil, may be supposed to look upon some magnificent Master-piece of Art, which he is required to imitate.—*Dr. Payson.*

**AFFLICTIONS.**—It seems as evident as noonday, that the same love which prompted the Saviour to bear the curse for us, would have led him to bear all our afflictions for us, were it not absolutely necessary that we should suffer in our own persons. I see, I feel, that he would as soon wound the apple of his eye, as give one of his people a moment’s needless pain.—*Ibid.*

**HOW TO READ SCRIPTURE.**—As Scripture may certainly be read in vain, or even wrested to our destruction, let us remember that a simple love of truth, and an entire submission to God’s revealed will, are requisite to preserve us from error. If, with these previous dispositions, we read in a spirit of prayer, and with patient meditation, not to gratify the pride of intellect, but to nourish spiritual affections, we shall overlook the difficulties at which many stumble, and shall penetrate deeply into the sense of the great doctrines of the Cross. The infinite love of God, “hidden from the wise and prudent,” will be revealed to us, though “little ones,” and his word will prove to us the sword of the Spirit\*, the means of sanctification,† our wisdom,‡ and our consolation.§—*Hon. and Revd. B. Noel.*

**THREE PRACTICAL RULES.**—One is—to do nothing of which I doubt in any degree the lawfulness. Another is—to consider every thing unlawful which indisposes me for prayer, and interrupts communion with God. And the third rule is—never to go into any company, business or situation, in which I cannot conscientiously ask and expect the Divine presence.—*Dr. Payson.*

“There are many who are solicited by the Spirit of God, yet who are not led by him.”—*Chalmers.*

“It is not by a flight of imagination that you gain the ascents of spiritual experience: it is by the toils, and the watchings, and the pains-takings of a solid obedience.”—*Ibid.*

“It gives important insight into the methods of the divine economy in this world, when we observe that the *promises* of God are meant not to suspend, but to stimulate our *prayers*.”—*Ibid.*

**THE AGENCY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.**—If you be not yet convinced of your need of Divine influences, go home, and try to perform some spiritual acts in your own strength: try to go to Christ with perfect contrition; to cast yourself upon him with humble confidence; and to surrender yourself unto him with entire devotedness of soul, body and spirit—for one little hour!—*Simeon.*

\* Matt. xi. 25.

† Eph. vi. 17.

‡ John xvii. 17.

§ Psal. cxix. 99; Rom. xv. 4.



## VI.—LOCAL INTELLIGENCE.

An admirable Pamphlet on the Scotch Law of Patronage, by M. Wylie, Esq., Barrister at Law, has just issued from the Calcutta Press, but reaches us too late to admit of our expressing more than the extreme gratification which its perusal has afforded us, and our most earnest recommendation of the work to the attention of all our readers. It is the very work that was wanted here. Its sketch of the Constitution and Law of Scotland in relation to the Church, is complete, yet well-condensed ; and drawn with the precision, and in the dispassionate tone, which befit a legal treatise : while everything like technical dryness is redeemed by the interesting nature of the historical facts which illustrate and support the argument. We would gladly make a few extracts, but the tract itself is short, and it is sure to be presently in every one's hands : extracts indeed, would do it great injustice—it must be read as a whole. Mr. Wylie has rendered an invaluable service in laying this full yet concise view of the whole question as a Constitutional one, before the Indian public. The advertisement on our cover, indicates where orders for the Pamphlet may be addressed.

Our readers will find elsewhere a report of Resolutions passed at a recent meeting of the provisional Committee of the Scotch Mission in Bengal. Of that Mission—to borrow the words of the *Friend of India* in reference to it—and of its “general claims on the esteem and support of the community,” it would be absurd to speak. The works of the Scotch Missionaries are their best commendation.” An appeal for support of such a cause as this, needs not to be backed by any words of ours : we simply request our readers’ perusal of the advertisement.

The Revd. Dr. Duff’s Third Lecture on the Church of Scotland, will be delivered in the Town Hall, on the 17th instant. With reference to the First Lecture, which we have the pleasure of giving entire in our present Number—it is right to mention that such parts or passages as were omitted in the delivery, to prevent the occupying of too much time, now appear in the text where they originally stood, or are introduced in the form of Notes.

---

## NOTICES TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

We should feel much obliged if parties desirous of having our *Journal* regularly forwarded to them, would communicate their wishes to our Publisher without delay. Some friends to whom the first No. of our Magazine was forwarded for inspection, not having expressed a wish for its continued delivery, have experienced disappointment in its non-transmission since. All future risk of such disappointment will be obviated by distinct orders addressed to our Publishers—which will be punctually attended to.

"An Episcopalian" is informed that the five Missionary Schemes of the Church of Scotland, are for the following objects, viz. 1. Education; 2. Home Mission, or Church Extension; 3. Foreign Missions; 4. Conversion of the Jews; and 5. Colonial Churches: and the General Assembly has been in the habit of yearly appointing certain Sabbath days on which every Minister of the Church throughout the land, should make collections in his parish for each of those Schemes in rotation. Our intelligent "Episcopalian" friend will pardon our expressing a gentle hope that he may see in this mode of proceeding, something of the practical common-sense efficiency of Presbyterianism as a system of national Church Government. We hope he will consider it to be in itself a fitting and becoming thing, that a Nation's Church should take the lead in opening up the fountains, and guiding forth the main-streams, of a Nation's piety and benevolence. The great business of Christian philanthropy is not left in Presbyterian Scotland, to be carried on independently of the national Church, but is conducted under her immediate sanction and responsible guidance: it is not left exclusively, as it is elsewhere, to be done, if done at all, by private Christians individually or associated for special objects: the Church and the Nation co-operate in it. The Church does her part in systematically keeping the entire nation, in every parish of it, awake to its Christian duties;—and being entrusted thereupon, with the distribution of a large portion of the bounties raised at her affectionate call throughout all her borders, publicly accounts for the appropriation of the same year by year. As we have said,—we hope our friend will see in all this, a moral fitness and propriety—something of the beauty of true utility, and of the efficiency of a system, widely extended, but which yet provides perfect unity of action:—and we therefore beg he will excuse us from illustrating the subject by instituting "Comparisons" which might, to his disappointment, turn out to be *contrasts*.

We had written the above, when a communication from another "Episcopalian" quarter, reached us; not dissimilar in its object, but very different in its tone and temper. Our latter Correspondent accuses our Church of "casting a reflection on all other Christian bodies by arrogating to itself the title of FREE"—and as a member of the Church of England he "defies" us to "show that religious *Freedom* is not as entirely secured to the members of his own communion as to any upon earth." For the sake of those brethren whose feelings we greatly respect—we regret our Correspondent's imprudence in writing us as he has done. We shall answer his challenge, however, by merely extracting a few sentences from an Editorial article of 20th July last, in the *London Record*, a leading and zealous Journal of the Church of England: sentences illustrative of the *freedom* which the Authoritative Standards of that Church secure to her members:—

"Our readers may rest assured if such changes as those now in view [alluding to the Bishop of London's recent orders,] are to be forced on an unwilling congregation, however respectable and however conscientious, it is but the first step to imposing a spiritual

yoke upon them, of the most galling if not unbearable description. *The Rubrics and Canons together, if enforced, will bind a man to ATTEND HIS PARISH CHURCH, HOWEVER DESTRUCTIVE THE DOCTRINES TAUGHT IN IT ; \* \* \* \* they will prevent him from communicating at any other Church ; AND BIND HIM DOWN, IN OPPOSITION TO THE COMMANDS OF GOD, TO HEAR THE INSTRUCTION WHICH CAUSETH TO ERR FROM THE PATHS OF KNOWLEDGE. \* \* \* Under the same Canons and Rubrics, and system of ecclesiastical law, a man MAY BE PUNISHED IN ONE DIOCESE FOR DOING THAT FOR WHICH HE MAY BE ENCOURAGED AND COMMENDED IN ANOTHER.*" Alas ! dear Sir, call you this "*Freedom*" and "*Security* ?"

In another *Record* we find the Congregation of St. Paul's Chapel, addressing the Bishop of London in the following words, which may also enlighten our Correspondent a little as to the *freedom* and *security* of those Christian privileges of which he ventures to boast :—

"Your Lordship has commanded these novelties in the Church we frequent ; it is not improbable the next Bishop who presides over this diocese may be of a different opinion from your Lordship on this subject, and countermand the order now given ; *we cannot consent* to hold our religious opinions on so solemn a subject by such a tenure."

They "*cannot consent !*" Poor gentlemen—but they *must* consent, if they remain in the Church, for their Bishop did not and could not by any possibility, help them out of their difficulty. And this is Episcopacy !—Well, well.

It is our rash Correspondent—representing, as he says he does, many besides himself, —who must be blamed, if these extracts give pain. They are at least the testimony of unexceptionable, because Episcopalian, witnesses.

---

Want of space precludes our insertion in this Number, of much interesting matter which we had noted for extract from home-sources : and this notwithstanding an increase, to the extent of almost a half, in the just dimensions of our Magazine, (in consequence of our wish to give Dr. Duff's Lecture entire) without any extra charge to our purchasers.

---

THE

# FREE CHURCHMAN

VOL. I.]

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1843.

[No. 4.

I.—LECTURES EXPOSITORY OF THE PRINCIPLES,—THE MAINTENANCE OF WHICH HAS LED TO THE RECENT DISRUPTION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, AND THE CONSEQUENT FORMATION OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

LECTURE II.—THE SOLE AND SUPREME HEADSHIP OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST OVER HIS OWN CHURCH.—*This Doctrine in primitive times—Encroached on by Popish and State usurpation—Revived with other Gospel Doctrines at the Reformation—Clearly and strongly asserted by the Reformed Church of Scotland from its very origin in 1560—The Church derives the whole of its Doctrines, Discipline, and Government direct from the Word of God, as the only infallible Standard, and Supreme Statute Book—The Church is regularly organized for several years before its recognition by the State—When, in 1567, it enters into friendly alliance with the State, it is on the express condition of having its Doctrines, Discipline, and Government, its freedom and independence as a Church of Christ, and all its scriptural rights and privileges fully secured and solemnly guaranteed by Statutes of the Realm—Sketch of the struggles with a usurping State, which terminated in the cession of the Grand Parliamentary Charter of 1592.—The subsequent struggles with a faithless Monarch, successfully terminating in the glorious second Reformation of 1638—Its mighty effect on England—The preparation, adoption, and ratification of the Westminster Confession of Faith and other Standards—The unparalleled treachery of Charles II.—The terrible persecutions from 1660 to the glorious Revolution of 1688—All these endured for the faithful maintenance of the Sole and Supreme Headship of Church—At the Revolution, this Doctrine illustriously vindicated.—Happy effects—Conclusion.*

In the last Lecture it has, we trust, been fully proved that the fact of the Lord Jesus Christ being the sole and supreme Head of the Church is a divinely revealed fact—that the principle involved in it is not a minor and subordinate, but a vital, essential fundamental principle—and, consequently, that the doctrine of the supreme ecclesiastical, not less than the supreme spiritual Headship of the

Redeemer, is not a doctrine of speculative and secondary, but of practical and paramount importance. We now proceed to shew that the doctrine is one, which, as an article of faith, has ever been upheld by the Church of Scotland—that it is in defence of it, she has often suffered in times past—and that it is her unyielding determination to brook no surrender of it now, which has led to her recent disruption and virtual disestablishment.

In the earliest primitive times, the doctrine of the supreme ecclesiastical Headship of Christ could not, from the very nature of the case, assume any of the more peculiar forms which it did in subsequent ages, when civil Rulers began to usurp the functions of Church office-bearers, and Church Rulers, those of Civil Monarchs. The Church, being a purely spiritual kingdom, or spiritually organized society; had derived from its sole spiritual Head and King, a spiritual jurisdiction and government, suited to its own spiritual nature and fitted to attain its own glorious spiritual ends. Such jurisdiction and government, in its very nature and essence, must have been wholly distinct from, and independent of, the secular or the civil. Each of these, in its own special and peculiar province, must be, not only distinct and independent, but supreme. And so long as each is rightly and wisely administered,—the one, confining itself exclusively to the temporal, and the other, to the spiritual concerns of men—there can be no untoward collision or hostile interference. In the times of the Apostles and those immediately succeeding, the constitution of the Christian Church was, accordingly, modelled, and its internal affairs entirely conducted in consonance with the revealed mind and will, or appointed laws of Christ, its great Head, as well as with the declared rights and liberties of his people. Church officers, distinct from the Civil Magistrate, governed, not with lordly but purely ministerial authority; and Church members, amongst their various and solemnly guaranteed rights, continued to exercise a substantial control in the election of their pastors or spiritual shepherds.\*

\* As this is a point too often denied by self-willed inveterate blindness, on the one hand; and by sheer helpless ignorance, on the other:—it was once my purpose to bring forward an overwhelming mass of evidence in support of it, from Bingham and Riddle, and other Episcopalian Authors, that treat of the Antiquities of the Christian Church. But, having subsequently met with some brief and condensed statements in two public Addresses delivered by the Revd. Mr. Brown of Edinburgh, I resolved to substitute these, in a combined form, instead;—*first*, because the authorities adduced are more than sufficient to convince all except the wilfully and the obstinately blind; and *secondly*, because Mr. B. happily exposes some of the singular blunders committed by Lord Brougham, in regard to the whole history of the subject, even when delivering his solemn judicial sentence, as a Judge in the House of Lords, on the first Auchterarder appeal. It may not be generally known, but truth requires that it should be told, that it is to the bitter, raucous, and inveterate hostility of the eccentric and not very consistent ex-chancellor Brougham, that the new, unheard of, and adverse decisions of the House of Lords against the claims of the Church of Scotland, are mainly to be attributed. With him aversion and opposition to the Evangelical party in the Church, and their Non-intrusion principles, would appear to be natural and hereditary. His own grand-father, by the mother's

In those her primal and halcyon days, the Church was spiritually too pure to desire, and politically too powerless to attempt, to invade the province of the State, so as to usurp any of its proper functions; while the State was religiously too heathenish to desire, and politi-

side, (a Mr. Sym) was a minister of the Church of Scotland, forcibly intruded on a reluctant people, by the bayonets of the soldiery, amid confusion, riot, and bloodshed. The entire population of the parish deserted the Church in a Body. Poor Mr. Sym, became merely the "stipend-lifter" of the Parish—having secured the fleece but scarcely one of the flock. Officiating, as he was legally obliged to do, every Sabbath, but finding nothing except bare walls and empty benches, and being apparently after all a man of some sensibility, he died, after a year or two, of a *broken heart*. At the time of his forcible ordination by a few wild men, imported for that worthy purpose, as a special commission, from the "Holy Land" of Moderatism, Aberdeenshire, there was only one friend present to countenance the lawless scene—designated in the record of the day's proceedings "a Mr. William Robertson, minister of Gladsmuir." This was the gentleman who afterwards became Principal Robertson, the celebrated Historian and Leader of the Moderate party. Mr. Sym, soon after his forced settlement, married Mr. Robertson's sister. When he, shortly after, died, he left a widow and infant daughter. This only child and niece of Principal Robertson, subsequently married Mr. Brougham, and thus became the mother of the present Lord Brougham. No wonder though he should be so enamoured of a cause (Intrusionism) so dear to his grand-uncle and grand-father! No wonder though he should manifest such repugnance to a cause (Non-intrusionism) which so preyed on the spirits of the latter, as to cost him his life!

But it is time to return to Mr. Brown, who proceeds, as follows:—

"In his Lordship's (Brougham) speech in the Auchterarder case, he says,— 'Now, it is to be observed, that before endowments were numerous, when there were very few patrons to present, when all that the Church consisted of, was a number of congregations, and when the provision for the parson or the priest was as feeble as the Church itself,—when he was paid accidentally, by casual offerings, and various fees, from time to time increased by clerical encroachment, but when there was no provision regularly made, by formal and substantial endowment—it is clear that the right of patronage could hardly be known; and, as the priest must be chosen by somebody, it appears that he was then chosen, not by the congregation, who were to be his scholars, not his patrons; but he was chosen by the clergy, by the clerical portion of the Church.' One would think, of course, that Lord Brougham refers here to the first two or three centuries, when the Church was in its infancy, before it was taken under the protection of the state. He proceeds, however, 'For your Lordships will find there is a canon in the year 428.' He passes at once to the fifth century. His Lordship's first authority, with regard to the infancy of the Christian Church, is drawn from the fifth century. Now, it is a fact well known, that during the first three or four centuries, so far from the priest being chosen, as his Lordship says, 'not by the congregation but the clergy,' he was for the most part, *aye*, even the bishop was, chosen by the people, and never ordained without their consent.

We find Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who flourished in the *fourth* century,—we find him, and other bishops of his time, speaking of the people having chosen them to the office of bishop. So far down as the middle of the fifth century, more than a hundred years after the alliance of the Church with the State, we find Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome, thus writing: "He who is to preside over all, ought to be chosen by all." "Let him be elected whom the clergy and the people, or the majority of them, may demand." "In the choice of a bishop," says he again, "let him be preferred whom the clergy and the people do unanimously agree upon and require. If they be divided in their choice, let the metropolitan give preference to him who has most votes and

cally too hostile to invade the province of the Church, so as to usurp any of her proper functions. In such circumstances, the very utmost which the Church could desire or expect from the State was simple toleration ; the very utmost which the State could offer or be expect-

most merits, always provided that no one be ordained against the will and desire of the people, lest they condemn or hate their bishop, or become irreligious, or disrespectful, when they cannot have him they desire." We find the illustrious Chrysostom, in the *same* century, thus writing in his Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles. He is commenting on the appointment of Matthias to the apostleship. "Peter," say he, "did every thing here with the common consent, nothing by his own will and authority. He left the judgment to the multitude, to secure the greater respect to the elected, and to free himself from every invidious reflection." After quoting the words, "they appointed two," he adds, "he did not himself appoint them ; it was the act of all." In the middle of the *third* century, we find Cyprian of Carthage (referred to by writers the most opposed to Presbyterian Government, as the best acquainted of all the early fathers with the constitution of the Church,) thus writing, in the name of an African Council, to the Christians of Spain who had written desiring to know how they should act, in case the bishops of their province should impose a pastor upon them. Says he, in name of the Council, "The people who yield obedience to our Lord's commands, and fear God, ought to separate from an erring pastor ; because they have the principal power both in electing fit priests, and in refusing those who are unworthy. This was observed, according to Divine Authority, in the Acts of the Apostles, where, in ordaining one in the room of the Apostle Judas, Peter addressed the people. Peter arose, it is said, in the midst of the disciples ; and the number of men was an hundred and twenty. Nor was this rule in the ordination of bishops and priests only ; we see it also in the ordination of the deacons." You will please to observe, that Cyprian not only states the practice in his own day, but along with Chrysostom, refers back to the *practice of the apostles*, not expressing the slightest doubt, either as to what that practice was, or as to the binding obligation of it on the Church in every age. The only other example I shall give, before coming to the inspired writings, is that of Clemens Romanus, who lived in the *very days* of the Apostles. In his epistle to the Corinthian Church, he declares, that the Apostles appointed approved persons to the office of the ministry "by or with the consent of the whole Church."

But follow Lord Brougham to his own period, 428 ; what is the authority he cites ? It might be enough to leave it to answer his own comment upon it : "Your Lordships will find there is a canon in the year 428, which shows that the election was in the clergy, though with the assent of the congregation. Plebis, says the canon, non est eligere ; est electioni consentire ?—(it belongs to the people not to elect, but to consent to the election.) That is all the function of the people ;—just as in the enthronement of the King ; which had been originally the actual choice by soldiers of their Imperator or Emperor in ruder ages, beyond the period of authentic history, long after his election had been disused, there continued the remnant of it, which we have at coronations up to this hour, by asking the people's assent, as a form." But, although it might be quite enough to leave the canon itself, 'It belongs to the people to give their consent,' to refute the comment, 'by asking the people's assent, as a form,' I will trouble the meeting with an authority or two, which will fix the matter of fact pretty decisively."

There is a passage of peculiar importance in Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, which though marked by that writer's well known hatred of the Christian Church, is invaluable as a historic record, coming from one whom no body can suspect of partiality in this matter. Says he, "the freedom of elections subsisted long after the legal establishment of Christianity ; and the subjects of Rome enjoyed in the Church the privilege which they had lost in

ed to concede to the Church, would be the boon of such simple toleration. Between such toleration and open persecution, implying, in a greater or less degree, the determination not to regulate but to destroy, there could be no neutral or middle ground. Since to in-

the Republic, of choosing the magistrates whom they were bound to obey."—"The civil, as well as ecclesiastical laws, attempted to exclude the populace from this solemn and important transaction. The canons of ancient discipline, by requiring several episcopal qualifications of age, station, &c., restrained in some measure the indiscriminate caprice of the electors. The authority of the provincial bishops, who were assembled in the vacant Church to consecrate the choice of the people, was interposed to moderate their passions, and to correct their mistakes. The bishops could refuse to ordain an unworthy candidate, and the rage of contending factions sometimes accepted their impartial mediation. The submission or the resistance of the clergy and people on various occasions afforded different precedents, which were insensibly converted into positive laws and provincial customs; but it was every where admitted, as a fundamental maxim of religious policy, that no bishop could be imposed on an orthodox Church without the consent of its members." The truth is, that even Popish historians acknowledge the fact which Gibbon here so plainly affirms. Take a specimen from the writings of the distinguished Father Paul: "As to the manner of electing ministers, I have already said that it was the will of the apostle, that the bishops, priests, and other ministers of the Word of God, as also the deacons, the appointed ministers in temporal concerns, should be elected by the whole body of the faithful, and afterwards ordained by the bishops through the laying on of hands,—a practice which continued without any alteration. The bishop was elected by the people, and ordained by the metropolitan in presence of all the bishops of the province. In like manner, the priests, deacons, and other ecclesiastical officers, were presented by the people, and ordained by the bishops, or else nominated by the bishops and afterwards ordained with consent of the people. A person not known was never received, nor could a bishop ever ordain those of whom the people did not approve; and the intervention of the people was so necessary, that his holiness, Pope Leo, proved the ordination of a Catholic bishop radically invalid, because he had not the consent of the people; and to this agree all the holy fathers of that time. Sometimes the bishop when he became old, nominated his successor; and thus St. Augustine nominated Eradius; but this nomination had no force without the approbation of the people. It is necessary that one be accurately acquainted with all those things, in order to confront them with what he will see to have been done in the times following."

But there is a still more extraordinary statement in his Lordship's next paragraph, which can only be accounted for by supposing that he has taken the letter referred to at second hand. Says he,—'Then, in a work which is deemed a great authority among the fathers, I mean Cyprian's letters to the Spanish people,' (I presume his Lordship, means that the works of Cyprian are a great authority, and so they are,) 'we find it written, that, 'no one should be ordained but in the presence of the people.' Lord Brougham then proceeds to reason upon Cyprian's letter, as if it said nothing more than this,—'that no one should be ordained but in presence of the people.' On this basis he constructs a favourite theory about the Scottish call. Now, what is the fact? I have consulted the original of the document referred to, and will state to the meeting how the fact stands. The Christians of Spain had written to Cyprian, desiring to know how they should act, in case the bishop of their province should attempt to impose a pastor upon them. He wrote them an answer in the name of an African Council; and his letter contains the following passage:—'The people who yield obedience to our Lord's commands, and fear God, ought to separate from an erring pastor, because they have the principal power both in electing fit priests, and in refusing those who are unworthy. This was observed, according to Divine Authority,



terfere, with a view to regulate would be to assume functions which involve not toleration merely, but *actual homologation* or *approving recognition*. This, however, a Heathen State which was unhappily led to regard an energetic faith, like Christianity, as treason against itself, could not possibly do. Hence, was there no alternative be-

in the Acts of the Apostles, where, in ordaining one in the room of the Apostle Judas, Peter arose, it is said, in the midst of the Church; and the number of men was an hundred and twenty. Nor was this rule in the ordination of bishops and priests only. We see it also in the ordination of deacons.' No doubt, the words quoted by Lord Brougham occur in Cyprian's letter, but the sentence is just cut through the middle. 'No one should be ordained but in the presence of the people—to the end, that the demerits of the bad may be disclosed, and the merits of the good proclaimed, and,' Cyprian adds 'that there may be a just and lawful ordination—*quæ omnium suffragio et judicio fuerit examinata*,'—(which has passed the ordeal of the suffrage and judgement of all.) The only other authority in the early Church to which Lord Brougham refers, (for as to Pope Stephen in the ninth century, that was the deepest darkness of Popery, and of course proves nothing,) is 'a rescript of Gelasius, in 493, which states that the right of rejection does not exist at all in people; for it expressly says, if their objections are groundless,—which implies giving a reason, and implies no veto, no dissent.' It will be observed that the only words quoted from the rescript (as it is called—a name, I think, commonly applied to Acts of Emperors not of Popes) are these—'if their objections are groundless' After what has been seen of his Lordship's authorities in Church history, it will be more than enough to set over against this 'rescript' the following words of Leo the Great, belonging to the same century—the fifth:—'he who is to preside over all ought to be chosen by all.' 'Let him be elected whom the clergy and the people, or the majority of them may demand.' 'In the choice of a bishop,' (says he again) 'let him be preferred whom the clergy and the people do unanimously agree upon and require. If they be divided in their choice, let the metropolitan give preference to him who has most votes and most merits; always provided, that no one be ordained against the will and choice of the people, lest they contemn or hate their bishop, or become irreligious or disrespectful, when they cannot have him they desired.' But there is one other very remarkable document with which I cannot help troubling the meeting. In Father Paul's history of the Council of Trent, we are told that a member of Council made this proposal, 'that the voice and consent of the people, in ordinations, being taken away, the Pontifical also ought to be corrected, and those places removed which make mention thereof; because, as long as they continue there, the heretics will make use of them to prove that the assistance of the people is necessary. He said the places were many; but to recite one, in the ordination of priests—the bishop ordaining saith, that it hath been constituted by the Fathers, not without cause, that the people should have a voice in the ordination of the rectors of the altar, that they may be obedient to him whom they have ordained, in regard of their consenting to his ordination. How remarkable this passage in various respects! First,—so unquestionably did the people's right exist in the early Church, that remnants of it actually continued in the Pontifical through the whole period of the middle ages, down to the Council of Trent. Again—the Pontifical declared, that it had been 'constituted by the holy Fathers, not without cause, that the people should have a voice.' Further,—the reason assigned was this, 'that the people might be obedient to the pastors in regard to their consenting to their ordination.' It was proposed, moreover to abolish those last relics of an ancient right, just as some would fain see the call put down and extinguished, finding it also a somewhat inconvenient witness for an ancient privilege. And in fine, the change was proposed especially on account of 'the heretics'—the Protestants, that they might no longer, from the Pontifical, find support for their doctrine, 'that the assistance of the people was necessary.'

tween the barest toleration, or rather sufferance, and the most active persecution. And what is the history of the three first centuries but one continued corroborative comment on this statement ?

When the Roman Emperors and other Heathen Powers embraced the faith of the cross, there commenced a series of intermeddlings with the spiritual government and internal affairs of the Church generally, which, when more fully systematised in later ages, have become better known by the technical names—in philosophy, of *Hobbism*—and in Ecclesiastical History, of *Erastianism*. When the Bishop of Rome, by a succession of unparalled usurpations, converted the Chair of St. Peter into the seat of an all-devouring spiritual despotism, there commenced a series of intermeddlings with the civil government and internal affairs of States generally, which ended in combining the censer with the sceptre, the altar with the throne, and the crown with the mitre in the person of the sovereign Pontiff—a combination, in the present sinful fallible state of man, of so revolting a character that it lacks a name—and may, therefore, be well designated the power and usurpation of THE BEAST. In the former case, the tendency has ever been for the State to swallow up the spiritual independence, rights, and liberties of the Church ; in the latter case, the fact has actually been, that the Church succeeded in swallowing up the civil independence, rights, and liberties of the State. Both of these extremes, involving virtually the claims of an absolute dictatorship and infallibility, are to be deprecated as being both alike Anti-Christian, and both alike subversive of the best interests of man.

But even in the darkest of the middle ages, a protesting voice was occasionally heard against the tyrannous encroachments of Papal Rome. Then, too, was heard the protesting voice of an Alfred, the greatest and wisest of Saxon Monarchs, against the equally tyrannous encroachments of the State. It well became him, to whose clear perception of the blessings of civil liberty, his country has been indebted for the precious legacy conveyed in these memorable words, that “it is just that the English people should be free as their own thoughts,”—it well became him to be, in reference to spiritual liberty, the author of one of those mingled felicities of sentiment and expression, which, in a single sentence, embodies the contents of whole volumes,—when he said, “I deem it a King’s true and genuine dignity, if in the Kingdom of Christ, which is his Church, he consider himself not a King but a citizen ; if he attempt not to exalt himself above the priesthood, but submit himself reverently and meekly to the laws of Christ, promulgated by his ministers.”

The Reformation of Luther, by shattering to pieces the Romish domination, restored to benighted and enslaved Europe the inestimable blessing of God’s Word with all its heavenly truths—of intellectual and spiritual light—of civil and religious liberty. Amongst the nations thus highly favoured, Scotland was not the least distinguished. Early in 1560, after a succession of terrible conflicts and martyrdoms, the Protestants of the Kingdom presented a petition to Parlia-

ment, craving "that the doctrine maintained in the Popish Church should be discarded as Anti-Christian—that purity of worship, as exemplified in the discipline of the primitive Church, should be restored—and that the ecclesiastical revenues which a corrupt hierarchy had enjoyed, should be applied to the maintenance of a useful clergy, to the promotion of learning, and to the relief of the poor." The Parliament of those days, knowing full well its own province, did not presume to step beyond it, by assuming ecclesiastical functions in attempting to dictate what the Doctrines and Polity of a Reformed Scriptural Church should be. No! With admirable consistency, they simply requested the Protestant Ministers, whose office and vow it was to act in the name and by authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, "to prepare a summary of the doctrines which they held to be conformable to Scripture." This was speedily accomplished; and in August of the same year, the Popish system was by Act of Parliament formally and almost unanimously abolished—only three temporal Lords reclaiming, to the effect, that they "would believe as their forefathers had believed," while the Lords spiritual "spake nothing." At the same time, as the record of Parliament bears, "the Confession of faith, *professed and believed* by the Protestants within the realm of Scotland, and *published by them*," was "by the Estates of Parliament *ratified and approved* as wholesome and sound doctrine, *grounded upon the infallible truth of God's word*."

"The jurisdiction and authority of the Papal Power being thus discarded and abrogated by the Estates of Parliament, no new ecclesiastical jurisdiction was by them enacted or substituted instead. Here was a notable procedure. "The Legislature," as has been truly remarked, "stretched forth its arm to relieve the Church of Scotland from a tyranny and usurpation under which it had long been suffering; and, having done so, it left the Church alone, and left her to the free exercise of her own intrinsic powers. It did not substitute another earthly dominion over the Church for that which it had abolished, or thrust either the Monarch or itself into the place from which it had ejected the Bishop of Rome. It set the Church at liberty. That was what it did. It sought not to prescribe what the liberated Church was to do, or how it was to be ruled. It was totally silent as to ecclesiastical tribunals. It never hinted at the institution of a General Assembly." There is not so much as the trace of an inclination, still less of an actual proposal, to transfer either in whole or in part, the spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction which had been wrenched from the hands of the Pope, to any merely civil tribunal or to the imperial crown. For, seeing that that jurisdiction and Government had been originally conferred on the Church by the Lord Jesus Christ, and that it embraced as its objects, "the preaching of the word, administration of the sacraments, correction of manners, the admission of the office-bearers of the Church to their offices, their suspension and deprivation therefrom, the infliction and removal of Church censures, and, generally, the whole 'power of the keys,' or spiritual authority," together with

the rights and liberties of the ordinary members—to interfere with it, or usurp it, or transfer it in any way, or in any degree, to any merely civil power, would have been an unhallowed invasion of His inalienable prerogative as her sole Head and King. And this deliberate resolve not to interfere, implying, as it did, a national acknowledgment of the supreme ecclesiastical Headship of Christ, from the very first dawn of the reformation, is the brightest jewel in Scotland's crown, as it has proved the most influential element in Scotland's History for the last three hundred years.

The adherents of the reformed Faith, thus left free and unfettered by the State, proceeded with amazing promptitude to examine their only authoritative Statute Book, the word of God; and to deduce from thence, and thence alone, their articles of faith and scheme of Ecclesiastical Polity. By the aid of this infallible guide, they compiled the "First Book of Discipline," which was subscribed by a large proportion of the Council, and soon became an acknowledged standard of the Church. It strongly asserts the supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ, declaring that it is "he whom God the Father hath commanded only to be heard, and followed of his sheep." It strongly asserts the rights and liberties of his people, setting forth that "it appertaineth to the people, and to every several congregation, to elect their minister"—and that "altogether this is to be avoided that any man be violently intruded or thrust in upon any congregation; but this liberty, with all care, must be reserved to every several church, to have their votes and suffrages in election of their ministers."

On the 20th December of the same year, (1560) the Church of Scotland held her *first General Assembly*. In whose name, it may be asked, was it convened? Solely in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. By whose authority? Solely by that which is *intrinsic* in the Church herself, as immediately derived from her great Head. In whose right were its proceedings held to be valid? Solely in right of Him to whom she owed undivided allegiance. The Church, that is, the members of the Church, ministers and people, transacted every thing in conformity to the mind of Christ, as revealed in his holy word. It was already a regularly organized Church of Christ—it was the national Presbyterian Church of Scotland—though not yet recognized or established by the State. Consulting, and not being required to consult, King, Lords, or Council, she drew directly from the word of God, and from that alone, her whole system of Doctrine, Discipline, and Government—a system, in her belief, every way consonant to the scriptural practice of the primitive Apostolic Church. Then, without taking counsel of any man or body of men, as such, she proceeded with characteristic vigour to discharge all the functions of a free and independent Church of Christ. Though the Reformed Doctrine had been recognized by Parliament, it had not yet obtained the royal seal and signature. But though, not fully, formally, or legally ratified, the Church went on in her own independent course, with a perfect consciousness that no such ratification was in any way needful to the validity of her actings. When Secretary Maitland once

ventured to express a doubt, whether it was right to hold meetings of Assembly without express permission from the Queen, it drew from our great Reformer, the silencing rebuke, "Take from us the freedom of Assemblies!—and take from us the evangel!—for without Assemblies—how shall good order and unity in Doctrine be kept?" For *seven* years, that is, from 1560 to 1567, two annual Assemblies continued to be held, without any warrant, sanction, countenance, or authority from the State. *Fifteen* Free Assemblies were thus held, which boldly, conspicuously, and not only without challenge, but with the approbation, actual or implied, of all the Estates of the realm, and the great body of the people, exercised the varied functions of a supreme spiritual jurisdiction—determining articles of faith—inflicting the heaviest censures of suspension, deposition, and excommunication—settling points of order and government,—sanctioning or restoring the scriptural orders of office-bearers—giving existence and powers to the several gradations of Church-courts, such as Kirk-sessions, Presbyteries, and provincial Synods,—and establishing all, in conformity to the spirit, principles, and examples exhibited in the word of God, and with implicit submission to Christ, the only Head and King. Thus, was the entire constitution and platform of the Church of Scotland completed, as to Doctrine, Discipline, and Government, without any reference to, or interference from, any civil powers or earthly authorities whatsoever.

On the 20th December, 1567, the first Parliament of James VI. formally established the already organized and subsisting Church of Scotland. In doing so, did the State pretend to *create* the Church, or to confer on it any one of its peculiar functions or powers, or to dictate to it either its Creed or its Polity? No such thing. The Act, simply but emphatically declares the previously existing Church to be, "the only true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ within this realm." It contains but a formal and solemn recognition of it, as an already constituted national institution with all its inherent qualities. The Act, as has been said, tells us, not that these (the ministers and people therein described) "were the true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ, *because* the State declared them to be so, *but* that the State declared them to be so, *because* they were so indeed." Were any censures passed on the proceedings of former Assemblies, as if these were unlawful, or unauthorized? No such thing. The right of these Assemblies to meet, act, and decide in their own proper sphere, is admitted to be as indisputable as the right of the Imperial Parliament itself to meet, act, and decide, in its proper sphere. Was there any surrender, on the part of the Church, of her own spiritual independence, or of any one of her spiritual rights or privileges as a regularly organized Church of Christ? None whatsoever. By another Act of the same Parliament "anent the jurisdiction justly appertaining to the true Kirk, and immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ," it is expressly declared, "that there be no other jurisdiction ecclesiastical acknowledged within this realm, other than that which is and shall be within the same Kirk;"—expressly declared, "that the *examination*

and admission of ministers within this realm be *only in the power of the Kirk, now openly and publicly professed within the same.*" And though a legal title to benefices or temporalities had been conferred by the State, as one of the peculiar immunities of an Establishment, it was expressly provided for by Statute, that, in the event of doubts or difficulties arising in connection with the settlement of ministers, the appeal should be, not to a Civil tribunal, but solely and exclusively to "the General Assembly of the whole realm, by whom the cause being decided, should take end, as they decern and declare."

Thus did the Church of Scotland suddenly emerge from the dark night of Popery, radiant with the lustre of truth, and bouyant with the vigour of a youthful and giant energy. By virtue of the intrinsic power derived from her great Head, she constitutes herself into a Church; adopts her doctrine, models her government, and regulates all her affairs agreeably to his word; convokes her assemblies, ministers ordinances, and exercises rule by his sole authority—acknowledging no Head but its Divine Author. For the sake of advantages, connected with her temporal support and outward extension in the world, and freedom from trouble and molestation, she eventually entered into a friendly alliance with the Civil Power. But did she, in obtaining "the aid, the protection, and the ratifying sanction of the Civil Power," thereby sacrifice aught of her spiritual freedom and independence? No; these were left altogether intact and inviolate. Being a sacred deposit from Christ, and involving his Headship and supremacy, she had no right to surrender them. But the very thought of such surrender she spurned away from her, as the suggestion of a traitor. And what was the result? A Church thoroughly Reformed and mightily blessed of God as an instrument in converting souls. "Yea," says Knox, "we must speak the truth whomsoever we offend; there is no realm that hath the like purity; for all others, how sincere so ever the *doctrine* be, retain in their *Churches* and the *ministry* thereof, some footsteps of Anti-Christ, and dregs of Popery; but we (praise to God alone) have nothing in our Churches, that ever flowed from the man of Sin."

But the season of outward prosperity did not last long. The world hated Christ because he was holy. The world hates his people because they are like him. The world hates his Church in proportion to its purity and spiritual energy. Scarcely had the Church received the civil sanction and ratification, than the secular powers began to encroach on her province, and thereby invade the rights and honours of her great spiritual King. But her jealousy for his rights and honours was only roused the more by opposition. To such a degree was this manifested that when a book was printed in Edinburgh, entitled "The fall of the Roman Kirk," naming "the King our Sovereign supreme Head of the primitive Kirk," the whole Assembly "ordained the said printer, to call in again all the foresaid books that he has sold, and keep the rest unsold, *until he alter the foresaid title.*" The higher powers proved faithless. But against a citadel so impregnable as the

Church then seemed to be, their approaches must be wary and concealed. Accordingly, they appear under an assumed mask and well feigned guise. Their temptations are most alluring ; their enticements most fascinating ; their friendly offers most captivating ; and their pretexts most ensnaring. But, though some were deceived and caught to their own undoing, the majority were enabled with piercing glance to detect, and with fearless boldness to expose, the insidious stratagems. Next, were applied the coarse and more vulgar weapons of desperadoes and tyrants—threats, and menaces, and legal terrors. But the freemen of the Lord, who upheld the royal standard of His truth, and visible symbol of His crown, were not to be scared by the vassals of an earthly or hellish power. On one occasion, the Regent having utterly failed to lure or coerce the Assembly into the adoption of suicidal measures, summoned one into his presence, who was a Chieftain among Leaders. In a tone of exasperation and fury he exclaimed, “There will never be quietness in this country till half a dozen of you be hanged, or banished the country.”—“Tush, sir,” replied the calm and undaunted Melville, “threaten your courtiers after that manner. It is the same to me whether I rot in the air, or in the ground. The earth is the Lord’s. I have been ready to give my life where it would not be so well wared, at the pleasure of my God. I have lived out of your country twelve years as well as in it. Let God be glorified : it will not be in your power to hang or exile His truth.”

At length, the King was constrained to temporize and make concessions. In July 1578, an Act of Parliament was passed, entitled “The Ratification of the Liberty of the true Kirk of God and Religion.” Its declared object was “the *maintenance* of the liberty of the true Kirk of God and religion, now presently professed within this realm, and purity thereof.” It, accordingly, “ratified and approved all and whatsoever acts of Parliament, statutes, and constitutions past and made of before, agreeable to God’s word,” for the attainment of this end. In all these statutes, nothing is ordained respecting doctrine, discipline, or government ; but all that the Church herself had settled, in the name, by the authority, and agreeably to the word of the Lord Jesus, was fully recognized, ratified, and approved. No liberty is *conferred* on the Church ; but her own spiritual independence, as a National Society of the Lord’s freemen, is fully acknowledged. No spiritual rights or powers are conveyed to her ; but her own rights and intrinsic powers as flowing direct from her Great Head, and already in full and active exercise, receive the civil sanction and ratification. In other words, these Acts did, in the most emphatic way, recognize and maintain the sole Headship and supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ over his own Church.

The State having thus a *second* time pronounced and declared the previously existing organized society of Reformed ministers and people, to be “the only true Kirk of Jesus Christ within this nation,” the Church, in the fullest consciousness of her own inherent spiritual powers after public recognition by, and friendly alliance with the

State, proceeded to complete in all its subordinate details, the platform of her polity. This she did by preparing her "Second Book of Discipline;"—which was agreed upon in the Assembly of 1578; inserted in the registers of Assembly 1581, "confirmed and covenanted to be kept inviolate, in the National Covenant, subscribed that year by the King, his Court and Council, and afterwards by all ranks of people in the land;" revived and ratified by many Acts of subsequent Assemblies; and according to which the Church Government was established by Law in 1592, and finally, after the Revolution settlement in 1690. This, therefore, is one of the most authoritative Standards of the Church of Scotland, viewed not merely as a Church of Christ, but as a National Establishment. Appealing, then, to it, do we find any compromise of the grand Doctrine of Christ's, supreme Headship, for the sake of any civil advantages secured to her as an established Church—or any surrender, which such compromise would imply, of her own independent jurisdiction, or the spiritual liberties of her people? So far from this, we find her language on all these points, more ample, more explicit, more unambiguous than ever. For, what says the Book of Discipline respecting the rights and liberties of the people, in reference to the election of office-bearers? "The liberty of the election of persons called to the ecclesiastical functions, and observed without interruption, so long as the Kirk was not corrupted by Anti-Christ, we desire to be restored and retained within this realm; so that none be intruded upon any congregation either by the prince, or any inferior person, without lawful election, and the assent of the people over whom the person is placed,—as the practice of the Apostolic and primitive Kirk, and good order crave." Again, "for this ordinary election, it is to be eschewed that any person be intruded into any of the offices of the Kirk, contrary to the will of the congregation to which they are appointed, or without the voice of the Eldership, &c." And what says the same Book, in reference to the matter of spiritual jurisdiction as flowing directly from the Headship of Christ?—After scripturally defining what is meant by "the Kirk of God," it thus proceeds:—"The Kirk has a certain power granted by God, according to which it uses a proper jurisdiction and government, exercised to the comfort of the whole Kirk. This power ecclesiastical is an authority granted by God the Father, through the Mediator Jesus Christ, unto his Kirk gathered, and having the ground in the word of God; to be put in execution by them unto whom the spiritual government of the Kirk by lawful calling is committed. The policy of the Kirk, *flowing from this power*, is an order or form of spiritual government, which is exercised by the members appointed thereto by the word of God; and therefore is given immediately to the office-bearers, by whom it is exercised to the weal of the whole body." "This power and policy ecclesiastical is different and distinct in its own nature from that power and policy which is called the civil power, and appertains to the civil government of the common wealth. For this power ecclesiastical flows *immediately from God*, and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is *spiritual*, NOT HAVING A TEMPORAL



HEAD ON EARTH, BUT ONLY CHRIST, THE ONLY SPIRITUAL KING AND GOVERNOR OF HIS KIRK. It is a title falsely usurped by Anti-Christ, to call himself Head of the Kirk, and *ought not to be attributed to angel or man, of what estate that ever he be*, SAVING TO CHRIST THE ONLY HEAD AND MONARCH OF THE KIRK. *Therefore*, this power and policy of the Kirk *should lean upon the word immediately*, AS THE ONLY GROUND THEREOF, and should be taken from the *pure fountains of the Scriptures*, THE KIRK HEARING THE VOICE OF CHRIST, THE ONLY SPIRITUAL KING, AND BEING RULED BY HIS LAWS. It is proper to kings, princes, and magistrates to be called Lords and Dominators over their subjects, whom they govern civilly ; but it is *proper to Christ only to be called Lord and Master in the spiritual government of the Kirk* ; and all others that bear office therein, ought not to usurp dominion therein, nor be called Lords, but only ministers, disciples and servants. For, it is Christ's proper office to command and rule his Kirk universal and every particular Kirk, through his word and spirit, by the ministry of men." In notes like these, which assuredly indicate no uncertain sound, did the Second Book of Discipline proclaim in the ears of the Nation and of all Christendom, the Supreme Ecclesiastical Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, as a fundamental article in the Scriptural Creed, and a fundamental principle in the Scriptural Polity of the Reformed Church of Scotland.

" But it is with true Churches collectively as it is with true believers individually. The existence of both here below is one of continued conflict and warfare. No sooner is one temptation overcome, than the Tempter has another in readiness. No sooner has faith gained one victory, than it is met and confronted with new assaults. No sooner has one enemy given way, or fallen beneath the sword of the Spirit, than a host of new ones start up ready armed for the combat. No sooner are the fair pretences,—by which the plots of the ungodly have been covered, and their malicious intentions dissembled,—unmasked and exposed to the derision of the righteous, than fresh broods of deceptive counterfeits, spring into being, like swarms of insects from the heat and slime of a summer's day. But what a consoling thought to know, that not a sigh can escape from the bosom—not a tear can bedew the features of a suffering believer or a suffering Church, amid all the trials, wanderings, and conflicts of the barren wilderness—that is not treasured up in Jehovah's "bottle"—that is not registered in His book of remembrance !

Stealthily, and step by step, did the King, prompted as well by his own inclination as by unprincipled and designing flatterers, begin to tamper with the liberties and independence of the Church,—now attempting to arrest, by means of Council writs, the execution of Acts of Assembly—and then, presuming to review sentences of Church censure ;—now, venturing to create for selfish and mercenary ends, a class of office-bearers which had been repudiated by the Church as contrary to God's Word—and then, daring to force obnoxious persons into responsible offices, contrary alike to the will of the people and the

decision of the competent ecclesiastical authorities. What, then, was to be done? Was the Church to be intimidated so as to sit still, and look on, and do nothing? Far from this, her spirit, instead of being paralyzed, grew in energy and strength. Against the rising supremacy, which was felt to be a usurpation of the prerogative of Jesus Christ, decided resistance was made, followed by fearless remonstrances. The two powers—the Civil and the Spiritual—were now at open war. The kingdom was convulsed by the struggle from end to end. In 1582, the Assembly prepared a new remonstrance, to the effect “that he (the King) had taken upon him a spiritual power, which properly belongs to Christ, as only King and Head of the Church; the ministry and execution whereof is only given to such as bear office in the ecclesiastical government in the same; so that in the King’s person, some men press to erect a new popedom, as though he could not be full King of this common wealth, unless as well the spiritual as temporal sword be put in his hand, unless Christ be reft of his authority, and the two jurisdictions confounded, which God hath divided,—which directly tendeth to the wreck of all true religion.” When this remonstrance was presented by the commissioners of Assembly to the King, the haughty and arrogant favourite Arran, looking round asked, with a frowning countenance, “Who dares subscribe these treasonable articles?”—“We DARE,” replied Melville, “and will subscribe, and render our lives in the cause.” So saying, he advanced boldly to the table, and taking the pen from the desk he subscribed; and his example was instantly followed by all the other commissioners.

For a time, the royal usurpations were held in abeyance;—it was the brief pause that preceded the storm. Soon was Melville summoned before the Privy Council, to answer for a sermon in which he had applied his doctrine to the corruptions of the times. He declined the jurisdiction of such a tribunal as altogether incompetent—saying, “they were too bold, in a constitute Christian Church, to pass by the pastors, prophets, and doctors, and to take upon them to judge the doctrine, and to control the ambassador of a greater than was there, which they neither ought nor can do. There, are (saith he, loosing a little Hebrew Bible from his girdle) there, are my instructions and warrant; see if any of you can control me, that I have past my injunctions.”

Still the infatuated monarch persevered—goaded on by the Shebnas and Achitophels of the day. With a united Church and people against them, they resolved to proceed warily, or rather clandestinely. The Lords of the Council were sworn to secrecy; and in the halls of State as in the dens of the inquisition, were hatched a series of Acts, which, from their combined treachery and atrocity, have been consigned to immortal infamy in Scottish History, under the appropriate designation of **THE BLACK ACTS**. By these, all independent spiritual jurisdiction was abolished; the king was made supreme judge of all ecclesiastical, as well as civil questions; and the affairs of the Church, from the admission into benefices to the deprivation of ministerial functions, were to be directed and ordered by royal commissioners.

Thus were the rights and liberties of the Church, and the supremacy of her great Head, laid prostrate in the dust, and trampled under foot by a usurpation as unlimited as the despotism of Rome. But did the Church yield or surrender? No ;—never. She vehemently protested against the daring insult offered to her heavenly King. A violent persecution ensued. The resolute language of her faithful members was ; “ We may suffer, but we will not sin ; we can die, but we dare not surrender the prerogatives of our King.” Wearied as they were with successive provocations, and worn out with an already painfully protracted conflict, they yet encouraged one another to suffer, declaring, that to be “ a witness for Christ’s glorious and free monarchy, as it is the end of the other two offices, so the testimony is more glorious to God, more honourable to his Son, and more comfortable than the testimony for either his prophetic office, or for his priesthood, because his kingdom was specially impugned at the time.” They farther enheartened themselves with the reflection, that, “ as it was the most important cause, and of the greatest consequence that mortals could contend for ; so it had this peculiar glory in it, that it was not only, for the truth of Christ, of greater value than the standing of heaven and earth, but also that it was the very truth for which Christ himself died, considered as a martyr ; and which concerned him to vindicate and maintain as a Monarch.” Thus nobly did they persevere. But the flames of persecution continued to rage fiercer and fiercer. For years, the roll of Scotland’s ecclesiastical history unfolds nought but confiscation and imprisonment, exile and death—with all the dismal train and retinue of mourning, lamentation, and woe. At length the hour of deliverance comes. The Church’s power of endurance wears out the heart and patience of the oppressor ; and, like her prototype in earlier times, she conquers through sufferings.

In 1592, to the joy of a distracted nation and persecuted Church, came forth a Legislative Enactment, which—from the amplitude of its details, the scriptural soundness and intrinsic merits of its contents, and especially from the circumstance of its being now part and parcel of the Statute Law of the land, in consequence of its revival and ratification after the Revolution of 1688—has justly been reckoned the great *Parliamentary* or *Civil Charter* of the Church of Scotland, viewed as a National Establishment. In this celebrated statutory deed, which is entitled, “ Ratification of the Liberty of the true Kirk ; of General and Synodal Assemblies ; of Presbyteries ; of Discipline, &c. &c.,” the spiritual power of the Church, as derived from her great Head, and, therefore, inherent in her of divine right, was distinctly recognized ; as well as the varied exercise of it in the free discharge of all ecclesiastical functions. The limits of the province and jurisdiction respectively of Church and State were duly appreciated, wisely defined, and solemnly guarded against present or prospective invasion. “ The jurisdiction and discipline of the true Kirk as the same is *used and exercised in this realm*,” is “ decerned and declared to be in all times coming most just, good, and godly in itself.” It distinctly refers to “ *the privilege that God has given the spiritual*

*office-bearers in the Kirk*, concerning heads of religion, matters of heresy, excommunication, collation or deprivation of ministers, or any such essential censures, specially grounded or having warrant of the word of God." It approves and ratifies the "full power of Presbyteries to give collations," in the case of all presentees to benefices, and "*to put order to ALL MATTERS AND CAUSES ECCLESIASTICAL within their bounds, ACCORDING TO THE DISCIPLINE OF THE KIRK.*" The King himself, in the presence of the General Assembly, publicly volunteered the famous declaration that he considered the then existing Church of Scotland "the purest Kirk in the world;" and with hands uplifted to heaven, solemnly protested that, "so long as he should brook his life and crown, he would maintain the same against all deadly."

One might expect that, after the hard fought battles of thirty years, or a whole generation, terminating in so decisive a victory, the Church would now enjoy permanent repose. But, it was not so. The law of vicissitude, stamp'd on all things sublunary, must run its course. When the sun has reached the meridian, it must begin to decline; when the flood tide is at its height, it must begin to ebb; and when the organization of every thing animate has come to its maturity, it must begin to decay. The Church, having now gained her meridian of light, her flood mark of outward prosperity, her maturity of organization, must submit to the same law. The demon of opposition had been silenced—not exorcised. And soon did he prove that he was not to slumber long. There were motive forces sufficient to awaken and bring him to the field of action. An avaricious nobility longed for the restoration of titular spiritual dignitaries, through whose lax and accommodating consciences, they might, with colourable legal pretexts, lay hands on a portion of the coveted patrimony of the Church. There was a despotically inclined monarch who,—longing, as with the insatiable crave of disease, for absolute and arbitrary power, and finding by far the mightiest barrier in his way to be a scripturally constituted Church, in whose Synods and Assemblies, numbers of intelligent and fearless free men could, in a moment, convene from all corners of the land, and give forth their mighty utterances on all public questions affecting the interests of morals and religion—strove, by all the wiles of diplomacy, and all the artifices of state intrigue to upset her free constitution, and control her popular courts by the introduction of a more pliant system of government, and a more subservient order of office-bearers;—shrewdly calculating that if he could only get rid of the annoyance of free Assemblies he would soon be able to quash free Parliaments. Thus, in passing, it may be noted that our Fathers, in resisting the encroachments of an Erastian supremacy over the House of God, as an invasion of the rights and honours of its great Spiritual Head, resisted in the most effectual way the encroachments of a despotic supremacy over the civil common wealth;—that, in preventing the Church from becoming the degraded tool of a civil supremacy, they pre-

served the nation from becoming the fettered slave of civil tyranny ;—and that, in fighting so nobly the battles of religious liberty, they fought most successfully the battles of our civil liberty too. Besides all this, the king, the aristocracy, and the whole race of the worldly minded and ungodly winced and smarted under the strict and impartial discipline of the Church. Neither rank nor station, wealth nor power, could shield the vicious, the profligate, or the profane from the censures of one, or other, of these free ecclesiastical judicatories. Libertinism and profanity were thus put in chains, and banished from the open light of day ; but their unhappy victims bore the wholesome restraint with restless impatience, and panted for their wonted license ;—while the king was goaded and mortified beyond measure by the constant biting taunt, that he, who was all but absolute in the commonwealth, was altogether powerless in the Kirk—and that he, who could remit civil censure and punishment at pleasure, dared not relax or in any way control the sharper and surer and still more galling discipline of the Church, with its rebukes, and public exposure, and penitential garbs of sackcloth and ashes. These and other kindred causes, combining, led to a gradual revival of the inroads and persecutions of former times.

Low cunning and bribery were soon succeeded by intimidation, fines and imprisonments. The object of the monarch, was still the same—to substitute his own royal power and authority, instead of the foyal power and authority of Christ, in the Church—and his own arbitrary and irresponsible will, instead of constitutional law, in the State. The object of the faithful champions of the church and witnesses for Christ's cause, was, to uphold the prerogative of their sole Head and King, and thereby secure and strengthen the foundations of a constitutional liberty, civil as well as sacred. In them the purest piety was thus happily blended with the purest patriotism ; and nobly did they sustain the threatening contest. "What am I?" wrote Welsh, the intrepid son-in-law of Knox, to the Lady Fleming, when arraigned and condemned to banishment, "What am I that he should first have called me, and then constituted me a minister of glad tidings of the gospel of salvation, these fifteen years already, and now last of all to be a sufferer of his cause and kingdom? To witness that good confession that Jesus Christ is the King of Saints and that His Church is a most free Kingdom ; yea, as free as any Kingdom under heaven, not only to convocate, hold and keep her meetings, conventions, and assemblies, but also to judge of all her affairs in all her meetings and conventions amongst His subjects. These two points,—*first*, that Christ is the Head of His Church—*second*, that she is free in her government from all other jurisdiction except Christ's—are the special cause of our imprisonment, being now collected as traitors, for maintaining thereof. We have now been waiting with joyfulness to give the last testimony of our blood in confirmation thereof, if it would please our God to be so favourable as to honour us with that dignity." The same dauntless and heroic spirit animated the whole body of the faithful. When the mounds of security were breaking down price-meal,

they presented in 1606, a united protestation to Parliament, obtesting, "that they would reserve into the Lord's own hands, that glory which He will communicate neither to man nor angel, to wit, to prescribe from his holy mountain a lively pattern, according to which his own tabernacle should be formed : remembering always that there is no absolute and undoubted authority in this world, except the sovereign authority of Christ the King, to whom it belongeth as properly to rule the Church, according to the good pleasure of His own will, as it belongeth to him to save his Church by the merit of his own sufferings ;—all other authority is so entrenched within the marches of the Divine command, that the least overcrossing of the bounds set by God himself, brings man under the fearful expectation of temporal and eternal judgment."

On one occasion, when the Commissioners of the Assembly\* deputed certain of their number to wait before the king, Melville stepped forward, and calling him "*God's silly vassal*," proceeded, says his biographer McCrie, "to address him in a strain, perhaps the most singular, in point of freedom, that ever saluted royal ears, or that ever proceeded out of the mouth of a loyal subject, who would have spilt the last drop of his blood in defence of the person and honour of his prince." From this memorable address, we quote the following passage :—"Therefore, sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland : There is King James the head of this commonwealth ; and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James VI is, and of whose Kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. For, those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over His Church, have power and authority from Him to govern His spiritual Kingdom, both jointly and severally : the which no Christian king or prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ and members of His Church. We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience ; but again I say, *you* are not the head of the Church, —you cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for even in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then freely to meet in the name of Christ, and to attend to the interests of His Church, of which you are the chief member." Such was Melville's noble testimony to the sole Headship and supremacy of Zion's King, in the presence of his earthly sovereign ;—and it was but the embodied confession of a suffering Church. Still, the tide of persecution kept rising—sometimes receding, and sometimes advancing—but, on the whole, gaining in onward progression.

A whole generation had passed away. when, in 1625, the King was summoned to render his account at the bar of the Omniscient Judge. Did his unlamented death bring any belief to a persecuted Church and nation ? None. His son, Charles I., not only inherited, but, under the influence of the notorious Laud, seemed determined to outdo the spirit and example of his father. His ruling maxim appeared to be,

that if his father had beaten the Scottish Kirk and people with rods, he must needs scourge them with scorpions. And truly without mercy was the scourge applied. For her unyielding faithfulness to Zion's King and Scotland's covenanted Reformation, the Church was made to drink the very dregs of bitterness and of woe. Her life blood was well nigh drained off:—still, though faint, she survived, and pursued the unbroken tenor of her testimony. "The noble tree," as has been beautifully remarked, "which had been watered with the tears and with the blood of martyrs, was now shorn of its honours by the same hand which had denuded the nation of its freedom; and its fruitful branches were lopped off and trodden in the dust. Nevertheless, like the tree, which in vision the king of Babylon saw, the stump of whose roots was in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, so that the might of the destroyer could not dig it up; so was the root of this tree deeply seated in the earth, and the affections of the nation were around it stronger than a band of brass, and the favour of God, may we not say, stronger than a band of iron? There was still life in that root. It was destined after many winters and many storms, again to put forth its strong and healthy shoots. It had again received its not unwonted nourishment—the blood of Scotland's martyrs—and again it grew and flourished, and put forth its boughs; and under the shade of that same tree, the glorious fruits of which are liberty, civil and religious, we till this day are privileged to rejoice."

' In 1636, the infatuated Monarch, in order to complete his impious usurpation of that authority which Christ, as Head, has vested in his Church, commanded, of his "own proper motion and prerogative royal," certain Papistical canons and a somewhat more than semi-Papistical Liturgy which had been purposely prepared under the Anglo-Popish Laud, to be used as the only form of God's public worship in the kingdom—strictly enjoining the contraveners thereof to be "condignly censured and punished," as "rebels against the king and his laws." The combined profanity and insolence of this bold bad act of civil and religious despotism, operated on the nation like the sweep of the hurricane over the face of the mighty deep. Instantly, nobility and barons, ministers of the gospel and representatives of boroughs, with whole multitudes of the people, were roused into vehement and uncontrollable indignation. Thousands and tens of thousands crowd to the metropolis. Against them proclamation after proclamation is issued from the Royal Vatican. But each fresh thunderbolt is received on the keen sharp edge of a nation's patriotism, and left to spend its force on the adamant rock of a nation's faith. Loyalty they still vow to the king's person; but demanding a redress of grievances, they boldly insist on simply "giving unto Cæsar, the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God, the things that are God's." In March 1638, the National Covenant is renewed, and in the Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, subscribed, in many cases with their own blood, by thousands of every rank and degree, who solemnly swear, "to adhere to, and defend the true religion, and forbearing the practice of all innovations already introduced into the worship of God, to labour by all means lawful to re-

cover the purity and liberty of the Gospel, as it was professed and established before the aforesaid innovation." "Now," dolefully exclaimed the astonished Arch-Prelate of St. Andrew's, when he heard the decisive news, "now, all that we have been doing, these thirty years by past, is at once thrown down."

To prevent the total dismemberment of his empire, the king now felt compelled to make concessions. Accordingly, in November of the same year (1638) an Assembly was summoned to convene in Glasgow, and the Marquis of Hamilton was appointed as Royal Commissioner.

After seven days, the Commissioner, finding that the Assembly was bent on asserting the whole of its intrinsic powers, as a free Court of the Church of Christ, dissolved it in the king's name. Against this arbitrary procedure, the Assembly protested, saying, "that it is unlawful in itself and prejudicial to the privileges that Christ has left His Church, for the king to dissolve or break up the Assemblies of this Kirk; for then it would follow that religion and church-government depended absolutely on the pleasure of the prince, &c." Accordingly, undaunted by discouragements, and unstaggered by the perils that frowned upon them, they fearlessly and in direct contravention of royal interdicts and decrees, swept away every remnant and memorial of a degrading civil supremacy and religious tyranny. All Acts and Statutes of former Free Assemblies were revived and ratified anew—Act and Statutes, in which special prominence is given to the two great characteristic principles—that "the Lord Jesus is the sole and Supreme Head of the Church"—and that "no persons be intruded into any office of the Church contrary to the will of the congregation." Never, before or after, were the supreme Headship of Christ, and the spiritual independence of His ransomed Church more illustriously vindicated. The era has, accordingly, been signalized in Scottish History as that of the SECOND REFORMATION.

In June 1640, the Acts of this ever memorable Assembly, with all civil and religious liberties were ratified and confirmed by the Scottish Parliament, and the oath and subscription of the King. All things were now settled and restored. Heaven smiled with manifest tokens of approbation. After a long and dreary season of darkness and deadness, cold and barrenness, the Sun of Righteousness returned with warmth and healing in his beams. The winter was past, the rain was over and gone; the flowers began to appear on the earth, the time of the singing of birds was come, and the voice of the turtle was heard in the land. A joyous spring burst forth into a glorious summer; and the rich blossoms of summer rapidly passed into the ripened fruits of a golden autumn. "The Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ," wrote a noble witness, "was greatly advanced; the gospel flourished; and the glory of the Lord did shine upon us with such a splendour, that it awakened England, and animated the Lord's people there, then groaning under those grievances from which Scotland was delivered, to aspire to the like Reformation."

The faithful in England having lost no time in writing to the Gene-



ral Assembly of Scotland, then sitting in Edinburgh, for counsel and advice, the latter powerfully urged the necessity of "unity and uniformity" in Reformation throughout the land. "There is nothing," said the Earl of Loudon, Lord High Chancellor of Scotland, more divine in God than unity, and nothing more diabolical in the devil than division." Eventually, in 1642, the Lords and Commons of England, in Parliament assembled, in their declaration sent to the National Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, professed "that they did not doubt but to settle such a Reformation of the Church as should be *most agreeable to God's word.*" And in their reply to the Kirk's representation, they renew the declaration saying, "that their purpose was to consult with godly and learned divines, that they might settle such a government as might be most agreeable to God's most holy word." And next they formally express an earnest desire "that the two nations might be strictly united for their mutual defence against the Papist and Prelatical faction, and their adherents in both kingdoms." This desire being cordially responded to by the Scottish Church and nation, the result was the production of the famous SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT OF THE THREE KINGDOMS, which "comprehended the purpose of all prior, and the pattern of all posterior covenants." It was first drawn up in Scotland, and subsequently subscribed and sworn to by the representatives of Church and State in the three nations.

The grand scope and tenor of this celebrated National Covenant—which, "for the moral equity of its matter, the formality of its manner, the importance of its purpose, the holiness of its solemn engagement, and the glory of its ends," the Scottish Covenanters held that no power on earth could disannul, disable, or dispense—did import, "their sincere and constant endeavours, within their several places and callings, for preservation of the uniformity in reformation, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government; the extirpation of popery, prelacy, error, and profanity; the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, and of the magistrate's authority; in defence of the true religion and liberty; the discovery and punishment of incendiaries; the retaining of the peace and union of the three kingdoms; the mutual assistance and defence of all under the bond of this covenant; and the performing of all duties we owe to God, in the amendment of our lives, and walking exemplarily one before another."

The most memorable result of this solemn engagement in behalf of a covenanted reformation, and a nearer conjunction of the Churches of the three kingdoms was, that the Parliament of England "called an Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and desired the Assembly of Scotland to send thither their Commissioners\* to propose, consult, treat, and conclude in all such things as might conduce to the extir-

\* The Scottish Commissioners were, Mr. Alexander Henderson, Samuel Rutherford, Robert Baillie, and George Gillespie, Ministers; John, Earl of Cassils, John, Lord Maitland, and Sir Archibald Johnstone of Waristoun, ruling Elders. But, though these were a minority in the Assembly, History testifies that in all its discussions, their voice had a preponderant influence, and that they were virtually the real authors of the Westminster confession, &c.

pation of popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, superstition, and idolatry ; and for the settling of the so much desired union of the whole island, in one form of Church Government, one confession of faith, one common catechism, and one directory for the worship of God."

All the Westminster standards were, without modification or reserve, adopted by the Scottish Church and Nation. In England, they were temporarily so far adopted, that the General Assembly of Scotland, in 1645, declared it as "more to them than all victories, that the Reformation of religion in England, and uniformity therein between both Kingdoms, was so far advanced, that the government of the Church by congregational Elderships, classical Presbyteries, Provincial and National Assemblies, was agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and voted and concluded in both houses of Parliament." Why these celebrated standards were at no time adopted, in their full and absolute integrity, by the English Church and Nation, it is wholly foreign to the scope of our present design to inquire.

One thing, however, in reference to the voluminous correspondence, at this time carried on between the Commissioners of "the Kirk and Kingdom of Scotland" and the English Parliament, is worthy of special note. It is, the exceeding jealousy manifested by the former in preserving intact, the doctrine of Christ's Headship in its varied practical applications. Do they refer to Church office-bearers? They declare these to be only *servants—ministers—ambassadors* of the Lord Jesus Christ. Do they refer to state alliance and recognition of Scripture doctrine and Church polity? They take care to urge the Legislature simply "to add its civil sanction to what the pious and learned Assembly of Divines, after long and serious, mature and accurate debates, have advised to be most agreeable to the word of God." Do they refer to the exercise of spiritual authority? It is to declare, "that the power of the Keys is not to be exercised at pleasure by any one, in a monarchical way, but by a company and college of ministers and elders, chosen with the consent of the people?" Do they refer to the independent spiritual jurisdiction of the Church? It is to vindicate it from the aspersions and calumnies of those "incendiaries and civil instruments, who will be raising jealousies against Church Government, as a collateral power erecting itself at the side of the civil, and in the end overtopping it, which is nothing else but to raise jealousies against the spiritual kingdom of Christ, as if it were inconsistent with the kingdoms of this world." Do they refer to the subordination of *all* persons, in things civil, to the State? It is strongly to urge that "without diminution of, or derogation unto the right and just power of the Parliament or Civil Magistrate, the expression of *subordination* may be altered ; because, it may suppose (contrary to the meaning of the Parliament,) that the relation of one General Assembly to another, and of the Assemblies to the Parliament, and of appeals of one to another, are of *the same kind* and in *the same time*, as if the Civil Power were not only *about* matters of the Church and religion, but were formally ecclesiastical and to be exercised ecclesiastically." Do they refer to the English practice of

appointing Provincial Commissioners for judging of scandals? It is to condemn it utterly,—“there being no warrant nor pretence for such a mixture of Church Government from Jesus Christ, who hath appointed his own spiritual officers to whom he hath committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and to whom the Reformed Churches conceive the judging of offences and the qualification of communicants, doth as properly and incommunicably belong, as the public preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments. Nor can it be supposed that some few civil men, having no calling from God, can be more able to judge of matters of this nature, than the Assemblies of the Church separated for the work of the Gospel, of which this is no small part.”

In these and other similar ways, did the Commissioners of the Scottish “Kirk and Kingdom” faithfully uphold the honours and prerogatives of the Church’s Head and King, in their protracted correspondence with the English Parliament. But, in spite of all their efforts, they were obliged in the end to witness not the desired “unity and uniformity,” but a “vast deformity and multiformity of sects.”

In 1649, every surviving shred of patronage was abolished by Act of Parliament, and the General Assembly was left, without let or hindrance of any kind, to arrange a scheme for the settlement of ministers agreeably to the word of God, and its convictions of duty to the great Head of the Church. In January of the same year, the ill-advised and ill-fated Monarch Charles I. dearly suffered for his despotic tendencies in Church and State, by paying the forfeit of his life. To his son, Charles II. then at the Hague, the General Assembly and the Parliament of Scotland, respectively, despatched Commissioners to negotiate the terms on which alone the Scottish nation could recognize him as sovereign. Amongst the propositions submitted to him by both sets of Commissioners, and which led to a long series of replies and counter-replies, it is not less characteristic than gratifying to note the marked prominence given to the following ;—“that your Majesty will consent and agree, that all matters civil be determined by the present and subsequent Parliaments of your kingdom of Scotland, and all matters ecclesiastical by the ensuing General Assembly of that Church”—that “your Majesty will ratify and approve all Acts of Parliament establishing Presbyterial Government, the Directory of Worship, the Confession of Faith, and Catechism, in your Majesty’s kingdom of Scotland ; as they are already approved by the General Assembly of the Kirk, and by the Parliament of that kingdom.”

Seduced by the caresses and allurements of Rome the King’s heart was already there. But master of the arts of dissimulation and ingratiating complaisance, through the example and teaching of jesuit preceptors and confessors, he at last succeeded in disguising his real sentiments and intentions, in overreaching and blinding the Commissioners, and in imposing on the credulous affections of a loyal and devoted people. Bound down, as all parties believed, with the cords of solemn oaths and explicit engagements, he, in the end, proceeded to Scotland. On

his arrival at the mouth of the Spey, and before he set his foot on British ground, the National Covenants were again distinctly read to him. On which, his Majesty, with right hand uplifted to heaven, took oath as follows :—"I, Charles, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, do assure and declare, by my solemn oath, in the presence of the Almighty God, the Searcher of hearts, my allowance and approbation of the National Covenant, and of the Solemn League and Covenant above written, and faithfully oblige myself to prosecute the ends thereof in my station and calling ; and that I, for myself and successors, shall assent and agree to all Acts of Parliament enjoining the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant, and fully establishing Presbyterian Government, the Directory of Worship, the Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, in the Kingdom of Scotland, as they are approved by the General Assembly of this Kirk and Parliament of this kingdom ; and that I shall give my royal assent to the Acts of Parliament enjoining the same in the rest of my dominions, and that I shall observe them in my own practice and family, and shall never make opposition to any of these, or endeavour any change thereof." Whereupon, he immediately took the pen and subscribed his great oath.

As if this were not enough to inspire the heart of the nation with assured confidence, he again, towards the end of 1650, emitted a fresh declaration, wherein, "Professing and appearing in the full persuasion and love of the truth he repenteth (as having to do with and in the sight of God) his father's opposition to the covenant and work of God, and his own reluctances against the same, hoping for mercy through the blood of Jesus Christ, and obtesting the prayers of the faithful to God for his stedfastness. And then protesteth his truth and sincerity in entering into the oath of God, resolving to prosecute the ends of the Covenant to his utmost, and to have with it the same common friends and enemies, exhorting all to lay down their enmity against the cause of God, and not to prefer man's interest to God's, which will prove an idol of jealousy to provoke the Lord ; and he himself accounteth to be but selfish flattery." Still farther, to banish any lingering doubt and render future mistake impossible, Mr. Gillespie, one of the Commissioners of the Kirk thus faithfully addressed him ;—"that if he was not satisfied in his soul and conscience, beyond all hesitation of the righteousness of the subscription, he was so far from over-driving him to run upon that, for which he had no light, as he obtested him, yea, he charged him in his Master's name, and in the name of those who sent him, not to subscribe this declaration, no not for the three kingdoms." On which, the king promptly replied ;—"Mr. Gillespie, Mr. Gillespie, I am satisfied, I am satisfied with the declaration, and therefore will subscribe it." So saying he took the pen and again deliberately subscribed his name. Never certainly had any Church or nation suffered more severely, or persevered more successfully in maintaining the sole and supreme Headship of Christ, as fully set forth in its accredited Standards and Public Covenants.

And never certainly had any Church or people, cognizant of such solemn oaths and declarations, as those now recorded, in connection with the strange events that afterwards followed, a better right to exclaim, "Oh ! unprecedented acts of deep dissimulation ! Oh ! unparralleled acts of premeditated perjury ! Oh ! foul and fatal and unheard of exhibition of blaspheming sacrilegious apostacy !"

The immediate prospects of the monarch were blasted, and his secret sinister designs left undeveloped, in consequence of the defeat and rout of his army, on the following year, at Worcester, by Cromwell. Having soon fled the country, for ten years, he wandered as an exile and a fugitive in a foreign land.

On his restoration, in 1660, matters were wholly changed in England. His great antagonist Cromwell was now no more. And with his demise the commonwealth speedily crumbled into fragments. Backed by a powerful party, not much averse to absolutism either in Church or State, he could afford openly to throw off the mask, and exhibit the nakedness of his perfidy. From the obligations of covenants, oaths, and promises, to which his faith had been solemnly pledged before "the Almighty God, the Searcher of hearts," he speedily discharged himself;—in this, practically acting out the famous maxim so unblushingly avowed by one of his royal ancestors, "that it became not subjects to burden their princes with promises, farther than they pleased to keep them."

Scotland especially, which had done so much, and sacrificed so much, to promote his interests, he was now to requite with acts of treachery, ingratitude, and cruelty that have no parallel in history. If his grand father scourged with rods, and his father with scorpions, it seemed the purpose of the son to bray the nation in a mortar—grind it to atoms, and scatter the dust thereof to the four winds of heaven. Having before dissembled with God and man ; he now appeared bent on affronting and defying the authority of both. All National Leagues and Covenants were disdainfully renounced and abjured ; all former oaths and declarations were contemptuously trampled under foot ; all Acts of Assembly and Parliament, which fenced in the rights and privileges of Church and State, were scornfully annulled ; the King was declared supreme in both ; an oath of allegiance was imposed which virtually declared him to be the only Supreme Governor in the *kingdom, over all persons and in all causes, civil and ecclesiastic* ; and, finally, as if all this were not enough, a formal act of the legislature was passed, declaring this royal supremacy to be "*an inherent right in the Crown*"—and that, in consequence, "His Majesty and his successors may settle, enact and emit, such constitutions, acts, and orders concerning the administration of the external government of the Church, and the persons employed in the same, and concerning all ecclesiastical meetings, and matters to be proposed therein, AS THEY IN THEIR ROYAL WISDOM SHALL THINK FIT." Thus were the civil liberties of the nation invaded and laid prostrate in the

dust ; while the Lord Jesus Christ was “exauctorated” and dispossessed in his own House and Kingdom, and his “usurping enemy invested with the spoils of his robbed prerogative.”

What course did the pious and faithful of the land pursue, when they beheld the crown and sceptre of their Lord’s supermaey thus flagitiously transferred to a frail, perjured, perfidious earthly monarch ? Did they relent, or relax, or shrink from the perilous contest ? No ; every where they met, protested, and petitioned with earnest prayers, entreaties, and tears, against all these acts of spirital treason. But their tears were confronted with derision ; their prayers with taunts and threats ; and their petitions with interdicts and scorn. Did they desist ? No ; not only the ministers, but the very peasants and artizans of those days were fraught with knowledge, fired with the spirit of heroism, and panoplied in the whole armour of God.\*

The testimony which they had to maintain was the most extended and comprehensive that had yet been upheld, embracing, as it did, all the specialties of preceding testimonies against “atheism popery, prelacy, Erastian supremacy, and civil tyranny.” But in “all its parts, points, and pendicles, it was most directly relative and dilucidly reducible to a complex witness for the declarative glory of Christ’s Kingship and Headship over all, as he is God, and as he is Mediator,—which is the greatest concern that creatures have to contend for either as men or as Christians.” In other words, the testimony, was in behalf of Christ’s Kingly Government and Crown. The supremacy of an earthly monarch, in matters ecclesiastical and spiritual, was disowned, because that involved a usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of Christ, as the Head of the Church, and the alone Lord of the conscience. To own such supremacy would be to disown Christ, and to dethrone him, by assuming that power to a human creature which is due to him alone. Therefore did they cheerfully resolve to lay down their lives rather than cease to proclaim and adhere to the Lord Jesus ; as a free King in his own kingdom ; a free Governor in his own House. In proportion to the faithfulness with which this noble testimony was maintained, was the increasing severity of the oppressors. At one stroke, four hundred faithful ministers were driven from their homes—reduced to beggary—and virtually banished the abodes of civilized humanity. All who preached in public or in private without licence from the king’s hirelings ; all who spoke, wrote, or printed one word against the existing usurpation, or in favour of Christ’s Headship, Crown, or Covenant ; all who re-

\* Bishop Burnet, in the “History of his own time” tells us that he was one of six Episcopal ministers, who were employed by Leighton, in the year 1670, to go among the people to combat their principles and remove their scruples. “We were indeed amazed,” says he, “to see a *poor commonalty so capable of arguing upon points of government, and on the bounds to be set to the powers of princes in matters of religion* : upon all these topics they had texts of Scripture at hand, and were ready with their answers to any thing that was said to them. This measure of knowledge was spread among the *very meanest* of them, their *cottagers*, and their *servants*.”

fused to attend the state ridden churches, now converted into houses of merchandise and dens of thieves,—were proscribed and outlawed. The whole of Scotland was turned into a hunting field ; and unless the Lord in mercy had interposed, it might have been “turned into a solitude, and then called a peace.”

But “what tongue, what pen, what skill of men,” can pourtray the trials, the struggles, and the sufferings of those evil days? As in them were gathered up and recapitulated all the testimonies of former periods, so in them seemed to be concentrated all the cruelties and torments of former persecutions. The tide of testimony had been swelling, and so had the tide of accompanying woe. As in the fitful gusts of a raging hurricane, the most vehement is the last ; as in the successive paroxysms of a burning fever, the most violent is the last ;—so, in the halts and pauses, the march and procession, of relentless persecution, the combined powers of earth and hell united in pouring the vials of their fiercest wrath into the last. Is evidence wanted to attest the appalling fact? Witness, ye Privy Councils, whose libertine nobles and crafty priestmen strove to outvie, under pretext of law, the blackest deeds of a Spanish Inquisition ! Witness, ye Courts of High Commission, armed with powers to search for and apprehend, to fine, imprison, or massacre without trial, all who presumed unitedly to pray or hear the Gospel,—all who refused to abjure their Covenant, or renounce allegiance to their heavenly King ! Witness, ye maraudings of a brutal soldiery, that trode over the butchered remains of an innocent and God-fearing people, with a blaspheming insolence, and satanic ferocity which equalled or surpassed all that has ever been recorded of Goths and of Vandals, of Tartars and of Turks ! Witness, ye iron screws and horrid moulds and all other enginery of ingenious malice, that dislocated the body joint by joint, or forced the marrow to mingle with the crude consistence of bruised and mangled limbs ! Witness, ye dungeons of Bass and Dunotter, and other crags and castles of the ocean deep, that beheld hundreds immured in mire and filth,—parched with thirst or stifled by a polluted atmosphere—bound to the clayey or rocky floor that never saw the sun, with a slow heat applied till the flesh was consumed from the calcined bones ! Witness, ye waters that were doomed, by your gentle rising flood, reluctantly to quench the spark of life in the aged widow and the youthful maiden, whom one expression—a single word against Zion’s king—would have saved from drowning at the stake ! Witness, ye flames that supplied a winding sheet to the body of many a murdered saint ! Witness, ye upland moors, and barren heights, and bleak mountain solitudes, bedewed with the tears, and consecrated by the blood of Zion’s persecuted children ! Witness, ye elements that, in open day or at dead of night,—as if instinct with sympathies denied by fellow-men—invited and enabled—

“ The scattered few to meet in some deep dell  
By rocks o’er canopied, to hear the voice,—  
Their faithful pastor’s voice.”

Witness, ye wintry storms and roaring cataracts, that foiled the pursuit of the tyrant, and baffled the bigot's cruel rage ! Witness, ye thunder-peals that "compelled the men of blood to crouch within their dens !" Witness, ye sheeted lightnings, by whose kindly gleams the sacred book was opened, and words of comfort were poured into the harrowed soul—which elicited hymns of high praise and songs of sweetest melody !—But what shall I say more ? For time would fail me to tell of the hundreds and the thousands, that toiled, and struggled, and died in defence of a Liberty—

" Unsung  
By poets, and by senators unpraised.  
Which monarchs cannot grant, nor all the powers  
Of earth and hill, confed'rate, take away :  
A liberty, which persecution, fraud,  
Oppression, prisons, have no power to bind ;  
Which, whoso tastes, can be enslaved no more."—

The hundreds and the thousands, whose blood was shed—

" In confirmation of the noblest claim,  
Our claim to feed upon immortal truth,  
To walk with God, to be divinely free,  
To soar and to anticipate the skies."—

The hundreds and the thousands, who lived unknown—

" Till persecution dragged them into fame,  
And chased them up to heaven."—

At length the hour of national deliverance came. A glorious revolution (that of 1688,) passed over the land, operating, like the genial breath of the south wind on the frozen horrors of an Arctic clime. The muniments and the battlements of a lawless tyranny melted before it ; and all the artillery of savage persecution was instantly hushed. Peace ran down every street like a stream ; and righteousness pervaded the land, like a mighty river. Joy and gladness were heard in the dwellings of the surviving remnant of the righteous. And such was the might and omnipotence of truth, as embodied in the testimonies of so many faithful martyrs, that great fear fell on all them who had walked in the ways of the Egyptian Pharaohs, the Roman Cæsars, and the Anti-Christian Popes. Myriads were awakened, illumined, sanctified, saved. Then followed a full redress of all past grievances—a full re-settlement and ratification of all subverted rights and liberties. God had brought the Church and Kingdom through the surges and waves of a boisterous tempest ; and now that the harbour of safety was gained, religion and righteousness, truth and peace, "the compend and height of all happiness," flourished and abounded still more and more.

Into the details of the arrangements that followed, in due course and orderly succession, commonly called "The Revolution Settlement," we cannot at present enter. These, with the ensuing events, on to the present time, we reserve as subjects for additional Lecture. Meanwhile, suffice it to say, that the whole amounted to as complete a vindication of the Doctrine of the Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus.



Is Christ really apprehended as the sole Head of the Church or aggregate body of those who make a credible profession of faith in His name? Then, is there instantly perceived the exceeding peculiarity of the relationship existing between Him and all the members; and the exceeding peculiarity of those ties sympathies, endearments, and tendernesses that ought to reciprocate between the members themselves. And is there nothing vitally and practically important here?

Is Christ really apprehended as the sole Head of the Church? Then, is the intrusion, the interference, or the substitution of any other, in whole or in part, felt to be the height of presumption, impiety, and blasphemy. And is there nought to affect, modify, or influence practice here?

Is Christ really apprehended as the sole Head of the Church? Then, is the freedom of all the members, as *his* servants, felt to be glorious;—freedom, not only from the vassalage of sin and the servitude of Satan—but freedom, from all restraints, fetters and compulsions whatsoever, that would burden the conscience, crush the desires, coerce the will, blight the affections, shackle the expanding energies of the emancipated spirit, or check its unbounded flight towards infinite excellencies. And is there nothing calculated practically to shape the tone, tenor, and complexion of character and conduct here?

Is Christ really apprehended as the sole Head of the Church? Then, must those whom he hath called by his Gospel—qualified by his providence and grace—and set apart by his authority to feed, rule, govern, and exercise oversight in his Church, feel the height and matchlessness of the honour of being chosen ambassadors of the heavenly King, to speak and act in his royal name and person, by his free spirit, and for his glorious cause. Then, too, must they experience an inexpressible feeling of loathing and abhorrence at the indignity offered to their Royal Master, by any extraneous interference with the tenour of their instructions, or the objects of their embassy—however apparently slight, trivial, or insignificant. And is there nought practically to affect the inner springs and motive forces of the soul here?

Is Christ really apprehended as the sole Head of the Church? Then, must all the members feel the peculiar glory, honour, and dignity involved in being exalted to hold immediate communion and fellowship with the Head—to carry on an immediate commerce and interchange with him in spiritual things—and to derive immediately from him all rights and privileges, spiritual and ecclesiastical. Then, too, must they regard any attempt to intermeddle, whether on the part of wicked men or wicked angels, with feelings of alarm and righteous indignation. And is their nought here practically to affect the streams and currents of impulse that circulate through the very veins and arteries of Society at large?

Is Christ really apprehended as the sole Head of the Church? Then, must all feel—feel powerfully—alike Ministers and people—the peculiar closeness of union to him and simple absoluteness of dependence on him, which this apprehension so essentially implies. What union more intimate—more sympathetic—than that between the natural body and natural head, can possibly be imagined? And what a striking and forcible representation this, of the closeness and endearment of the vital union established by effectual grace between Christ and true believers! Or, again, what union, involving more absolute dependence, than that between the head and the body, can possibly be conceived? With what combined propriety and energy, then, does this pourtray the completeness of the dependence of the Church which is his body, on Christ, the great Head! And if the closeness of the union be so intimate and the dependence so absolute, who can dare to thrust himself, with his crudities and devices, between the spiritual Body and the spiritual Head,—so as to loosen, weaken, or sever the bond of connection between them—without inflicting as deadly an injury on the souls of believers, as would be received by the members of the natural body, were the nerves and ligaments, that bound them to the living natural head, bruised, or mutilated, or wholly severed. And do no vital, no practical influences emanate from realized apprehensions like these? Verily, the Doctrine of the Supreme Headship of Christ, vividly realized and practically applied, is one on which the souls of true believers daily feed as on heavenly manna—feed, and are revived, invigorated, and refreshed.

## II.—EXTRACTS FROM AN ADDRESS TO HIS PARISHIONERS.

BY THE REV. J. A. WALLACE, [then] Minister of Hawick; entitled "*Reasons for concurring in the Resolutions of the Convocation.*"

[*The Convocation of Ministers of the Evangelical party in the Church, took place—as our readers may recollect—in Edinburgh, in November, 1842, shortly before the meeting of Parliament; when upwards of 400 Clergymen solemnly pledged themselves to various Resolutions, the general nature and necessity of which are with remarkable clearness set forth in Mr. Wallace's Address from which we now make extracts. We commend these plain words of truth and soberness to the candid judgment of any intelligent Christian.*]

There are three principles involved in the recent decisions of the Civil Courts with which I cannot conscientiously concur, and which if sanctioned and confirmed by the supreme power of the State, will force me to relinquish my connexion with the Established Church.

The first of these principles is this:—That Presbyteries are bound to settle Ministers in parishes according to the law of patronage, and without the concurrence of the people.

Now here I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I have no *insuperable* objections to the law of patronage itself. I can easily conceive how it could be rightly and profitably exercised; and though in certain circumstances I may feel it to be a grievance, and may protest against it, yet I do not go the length of affirming that the thing is in itself unrighteous and unscriptural. For if I did, I should feel that it was impossible for me to accept a presentation, without doing an unwarrantable act, and subjecting myself to the charge of sin. But my view is this: the presentation I consider in the light of a civil privilege, giving me a legal title to the emoluments of the office which I hold, but to nothing more; and unless, in addition to the presentation, I receive the approval of the Presbytery on the one hand, and be furnished with the call of the people on the other, I feel that I could not warrantably exercise the functions of the sacred office, or look for the divine blessing on my ministry. Indeed I consider the concurrence of the people to be an element of such vital importance in the formation of the pastoral relationship, that without it I would reckon any presentation to be a thing of nought; I would never carry it into effect.

The principle on which the Civil Courts are now proceeding is very different. A man, for example, is presented to a parish. The people, with one or two exceptions, refuse to receive him. They solemnly declare that they cannot be edified by his ministrations; and because the people will not call him, or because they dissent against him, the Presbytery decline to proceed with the settlement. A process in consequence is raised in the Civil Courts, and the result not only is, that the stipend is left at the disposal of the patron, but an action of damages to the extent of £16,000 is raised against the Presbytery for refusing to induct the presentee; and that action in point of relevancy has been sustained.

Now here in my view, the grievance does not consist merely in the enormous damages to which a Presbytery may be subjected, when giving themselves to the conscientious discharge of their duty, and carrying out a fundamental principle in the constitution of the Church; but the principal thing to which I look is this, that it not only opens a wide door for the settlement of pastors who may be altogether unacceptable, but it makes it

imperative on Christ's ministers to invest a presentee with all the functions of the sacred office, without the concurrence, and it may be in direct opposition to the wishes and remonstrances of the people whose souls are entrusted to his charge.

It is true that I myself have not been called to do this. A case has not occurred within the bounds of the Presbytery with which I am connected. But the principle itself has been laid down, and declared to be accordant with the law of the land. And when the next vacancy occurs, I must either act upon it, and thereby do what I believe to be inconsistent with the constitution of the Church, and subversive of the Christian privileges of the people, or if I refuse to involve myself in the guilt of such solemn profanation, I expose myself to the charge of rebellion, and am therefore liable to the penalties which it is competent for the civil law to inflict.

Such, then, is my first reason for the step I have taken. I hold, in accordancq with the constitution of the Church, in deference to the authority of Christ its supreme Head, and in consideration of the very nature of the pastoral relationship, that no minister ought to be settled in a parish without the concurrence of the people. And if I am not at liberty to carry that principle into effect, nay, if I am actually compelled, by the authority of the law, or by the infliction of civil penalties to set it aside, or to go in the very face of it, then I feel that I cannot do it with a clear conscience; and rather than be so bound and astricted, I have made up my mind to dissolve my connexion with the Established Church.

The second principle to which I object is the alleged right of the Civil Courts to interfere with the internal government of the Church.

Various interdicts have recently been granted by the Civil Courts, which go upon the assumption that they are not only entitled to exercise jurisdiction in regard to all temporal matters,—a right which the Church is prepared to admit to its fullest extent,—but that it is their prerogative moreover to overrule, to regulate, and to review the decisions of all Church Courts, in regard to matters that are ecclesiastical: matters which relate to the exercise of discipline,—matters connected with the preaching of the gospel,—matters that have reference to the ordination or the deposition of ministers. Now how does this principle operate? Why I feel it to be an encroachment on the rights which I claim as a Minister of the Established Church, and which I did solemnly swear to exercise when set apart by ordination to the sacred office. I engaged, for example, to yield obedience to my ecclesiastical superiors, subjecting myself in all spiritual matters to their jurisdiction, and promising to fulfil the duties of the ministerial office from a regard to the glory of God, and in conformity with the standards of the Church. But the Civil Courts interpose their authority in such a way as may prevent me from carrying my ordination vows into effect, and acting according to my own solemn convictions of duty, as I shall answer at the bar of God. If I am sent by the authority of the General Assembly to preach the gospel in a particular district, I may be prohibited from so doing by the power of the Civil Courts. If I take part in the deposition from the sacred office, of a minister convicted of crimes so grossly immoral, that they are punishable by the Civil Law, an action may be raised against me for so doing. If in the exercise of a salutary discipline, I exclude a man from the Table of Communion, who has been guilty of the sin of drunkenness, I am liable to the infliction of civil penalties. If I am returned by the Presbytery with which I am connected as a member of our Supreme Ecclesiastical Court, I may be interdicted from taking my seat, and fulfilling the duty which by virtue of my ordination vows I have sworn to perform. These are not imaginary cases. *They have actually occurred in different Presbyteries of the Church; and if it be competent for the Civil*

Courts to proceed upon such principles, and to give effect to such interdicts in the case of one man, or of one Presbytery, it is of course competent for them to do the same thing in the case of all the rest. Not a single Minister—not a single Presbytery is safe from their interference; and the interference seems to me of such a character, and has been carried to such an extent, and may be followed with such penalties, as never can be tolerated by any Minister of Christ, without divesting himself of the rights which have been conferred upon him at his ordination, and rendering null and void the entire discipline of the Church.

Here, then, is the position in which I am placed. In the preaching of the Gospel, in the dispensation of divine ordinances, and in the exercise of church discipline, I must act, if I act at all, in accordance with the principles of the Bible, and in fulfilment of my own solemn engagement. But if the Civil Courts interpose their authority, and enjoin me to act in matters such as these, not according to my own conscientious conviction of duty—not according to the tenor of my ordination vows—not according to the law and constitution of the Church of Scotland, but in a way that I believe to be in direct and palpable opposition to them all, then it just comes to this, that I must either yield obedience in regard to all that they require at my hands, and thereby do violence to my own conscience, and involve myself in the guilt of perjury; or, in order to save myself from the perpetration of such guilt, I must be defended from the Erastian encroachments of the Civil Courts; or, should that be found impracticable, the only alternative that remains, is to resign the benefits of the Establishment.

The third reason which weighs deeply on my mind, is the attempt now making, for the exclusion from our Church Courts of all Ministers who have not been presented according to the law of patronage, or who do not receive their endowments from the State.

There are upwards of two hundred Ministers who have been settled in what were formerly called chapels of ease, or in churches recently erected in various districts of the land, by means of the contributions of the people to the Church Extension Scheme. These Ministers with few exceptions are men of exemplary character; zealous, faithful preachers of the Gospel. For the most part they have received their appointments from the people amongst whom they minister in holy things; and in many places their influence has been very remarkable in promoting the spirit of pure and undefiled religion,—in bringing the precious ordinances of the Gospel within reach of many who from the want of accommodation in the parish churches, or from other causes, were altogether strangers to the joyful sound,—and in the correction and reformation of various abuses in the Church Courts, into which they have been admitted. A process is now going on, which, if successful, will have the effect of excluding all these men from our Church Courts, and virtually declaring them to be no longer Ministers of the Establishment. The process is not yet terminated, but little doubt is entertained as to the issue, and various harassing interdicts have been granted in the meantime. Indeed the heritors of a parish have already refused to pay stipend to a Minister, on the ground, I understand, that one of these chapel Ministers had taken part in his ordination; and a Minister who has been deposed from the sacred office for immoral conduct, has been protected and secured in the enjoyment of his privileges as a Minister of the Establishment for the same reason, or, in other words, because there were *quoad sacra* Ministers in the Church Courts, by whose authority the sentence of deposition was pronounced.

To the principle involved in these processes, I have serious objections. It seems to proceed on the assumption, that the holding of a presentation, or the receiving of an endowment from the State, is indispensable to entitle

a Minister of Christ to sit in our Church Courts, to take the spiritual oversight of a specified district, or to share in any of the deliberations that may be necessary for the glory of God, and the good of his people. And if that principle is henceforward to be carried out, it will not only lay an arrest for the future on the noble efforts which are now making, by means of the Church Extension Scheme, for multiplying the opportunities of religious worship, so as to meet the necessities of an increasing and neglected population, but it will have the effect of vitiating the decisions which have been come to by every Kirk-Session, and Presbytery, and Synod, and General Assembly, into which these Ministers have been introduced in times past; and not only so, but it will go to the exclusion from our Church Courts of upwards of two hundred of the most faithful and efficient of our Ministers, which of itself were one of the greatest calamities to which the church could be subjected. And rather than be separated from the devoted men who would thereby be driven from their position as rulers in our Church, I would sacrifice all the advantages which my Presentation has conferred upon me, and go along with them. For I can discover no reason for the exclusion of such men from the Courts of the Church of Scotland, if it is not to be found in this, that it will tend, and tend most effectually, to diminish the number of Christ's faithful Ministers in the Church, and once more to give the ascendancy to a party, whose ministrations in very many instances, and over whole districts, have been a withering curse, instead of a saving blessing, to the souls entrusted to their charge.

These are the principles in which I cannot acquiesce. 1. The settlement of Pastors without the consent of the people. 2. The interference of the Civil Courts in the internal government of the Church. 3. The exclusion of the *quoad sacra* Ministers from seats in our Church Courts.

I am well aware that in the view of some, these principles are not of sufficient importance to justify the decisive step which they have led me to take, and I know, moreover, that there are many Ministers in the Church of Scotland, whose opinions in regard to such matters are very different from my own, and who may feel no difficulty in acquiescing in the decisions of the Civil Courts, and carrying on the government of the Church accordingly. Every man, in regard to these, and all other matters, has a right to judge for himself, and whatever his judgment may be, it is not for me to bring against him a railing accusation. To his own Master he must stand or fall, and at the day of final reckoning every one of us must answer for himself. I speak merely for my own vindication. The reasons I have stated may not carry conviction to other minds, and the part I have taken may lead to results which I cannot myself contemplate without anxiety and alarm. But otherwise I feel that I could not act, for looking at the decisions to which the Civil Courts have come, and the grounds on which they rest, I cannot resist the conviction that they involve principles contrary to the Confession of Faith, and inconsistent with the constitution of the Church of Scotland, and therefore I could take no part in carrying them into effect.

And now, my dear Friends, having laid these matters before you, I cannot close without remarking, that God appears to be preparing by the solemn movements of his Providence, for a process of the sternest sifting, when those of you who are Christians by mere profession will probably be separated from those who are Christians in deed and in truth; and when the main controversy will be, not between one party and another, in regard to matters of secondary and subordinate importance, but between Christ on the one hand, and the world on the other. If we read the signs of the present times aright, that is the very trial that is drawing near to us all; and in the course of it, we doubt not, that the language of Daniel shall be strikingly fulfilled: "Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried;

but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand: but the wise shall understand."

For such a trial there seems to be an urgent need. In this Christian land, and for a considerable time back, all classes of men have been very much mingled together. The broad and characteristic distinctions between the disciples of Christ and the men of the world have been in a great measure lost sight of. The enmity which God meant to be eternal and uncompromising between the seed of the woman and the serpent has been permitted almost to die away. The world and the Church have joined hands together as if they were brethren, and the peace which the world loves has been the result. But God appears to be taking the matter into his own hands; and we understand nothing, either of the philosophy of history, or of the principles of the Bible, if his providential procedure at the present time do not lead to this result,—that a line of broad and palpable distinction shall be drawn between the men of the world, and those whose lives are hid with Christ in God. The judgment and the trial seem already to be beginning with the house of God, and with God's Ministers; and it is likely to be a stern sifting for us all—such a sifting as will put every thing like neutrality out of our power, either constraining us by the fear of man which bringeth a snare to make shipwreck of our faith, and to cast in our lot with the men of the world who have their portion only in this life, or impelling us in the integrity of our spirits, and in the strength of firm, unshaken, and unalterable principle to go beyond the camp, bearing Christ's cross, and suffering its reproach.

Nor is it likely that the trial will stop with us. In all likelihood it will also pass into the bosom of your families, and unto all of you whose hearts are right in the sight of God, and who are steadfast in Christ's covenant, it need not be surprizing, though it should be felt, and felt, with a bitterness not to be described, that a man's enemies shall be they of his own household.

Let me, therefore, urge upon you all the vast and infinite importance of closing in right earnest with the overtures of the gospel, and entering with the Divine Redeemer into an everlasting covenant never to be forgotten. If you rest satisfied with anything that is short of this, it is not for a moment to be expected that you can stand the day of visitation and of trial; nay, it were not in the least degree surprizing that notwithstanding your professed attachment to the gospel, and your apparent satisfaction with the joyful sound, you should withdraw beyond the reach of its invitations, and join yourselves to the ranks of its mortal enemies. Many a man, who in peaceful times has given his preference to the gospel, and to gospel ordinances, and to gospel ministers, has shifted his position in the day of trial, and when worldly interests were at stake, has become a persecutor of the saints, and an enemy of the cross of Christ.

But if you truly join yourselves in covenant unto the Lord, it is not for me to comfort or to encourage you. Christ himself will take the charge of you. And however many there may be that may part from your company, or affect to make you the object of their contempt, or cast suspicion on the motives by which you are actuated, or even lift up the heel against you, till peradventure you are reduced to a very little flock, yet your's, I doubt not, will be the precious promise:—"Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's goodwill to give you the kingdom." Only keep close to your Almighty and all-sufficient Redeemer, cultivating the habit of intimate communion with his Spirit, and committing your bodies,—and your souls,—and your spirits,—and your families,—and all that you have into his hands; and do not doubt that in his hands all of them will be safe. He will keep carefully whatsoever is committed to his charge, hiding it in the meantime in the

secret of his tabernacle, and at last presenting it faultless before the presence of his Father, even with exceeding joy.

Dec. 1842.

### III.—NABAL AND DAVID.

*A word of friendly remonstrance, to the opponents of Free Church of Scotland.*

DEAR FRIENDS,—We ask you for aid and sympathy in our endeavour to maintain those principles, which, whether right or wrong in themselves, were, as you will own, the principles of our forefathers, and which are now held by the brightest ornaments of our religion and of our country. We are then met with the taunt that we are Shismatics, that we are only additional illustrations of the follies of Dissent ; and so on. Now let me, as one of those who grieve that you should be so mistaken, let me ask you to consider well, before you thus reproach us. Let me beg you to think, if your conduct is not precisely like that, which the enemies of our faith displayed at the time of the Reformation, and at all other periods of the Church's history. In particular, I would request your attention to a remarkable and very interesting passage in the word of God, which throws light on your unkindness.

David was compelled to be a wanderer ; and among other places in which he sought refuge, was the wilderness of Paran. Now hear the beautifully simple account, given by the pen of inspiration, of an incident that befell him in his troubles. (1 Samuel xxv. 2-11) “And there was a man in Maon, whose possessions were in Carmel ; and the man was very great, and he had three thousand sheep and a thousand goats : and he was shearing his sheep in Carmel. Now the name of this man was Nabal, and the name of his wife Abigail ; and she was a woman of a good understanding, and of a beautiful countenance ; but the man was churlish, and evil in his doings ; and he was of the house of Caleb. And David sent out ten young men, and David said to the young men, get you up from Carmel and go to Nabal, and greet him in my name : and thus shall ye say to him that liveth in prosperity ; peace be both to thee, and peace be to thine house, and peace be unto all that thou hast. And now I have heard that thou hast shearers. Now thy shepherds which were with us, we hurt not, neither was there ought missing unto them, all the while they were in Carmel. Ask thy young men and they will shew thee. Wherefore let the young men find favour in thine eyes, for we come in a good day ; give, I pray thee, whatsoever cometh to thine hand unto thy servants and thy son David, And when David's young men came, they spake to Nabal according to all those words in the name of David, and ceased. And Nabal answered David's servants, and said who is David ? and who is the son of Jesse ? there be many servants now-a-days that break away every man from his master.”

Let me now ask you, in affection and sincerity, are not these words, the secret utterances of *your* hearts? Were they not also the thoughts of those, who would have checked the Apostles, when they "broke away" from the Jewish polity? Were they not the thoughts of those, (some of them like Pliny and the Emperor Trajan, most amiable men,) who would have compelled the Early Christians, to perform again, their ancient national sacrifices? Were not similar thoughts in the hearts of the Emperor Charles the 5th, of Erasmus, of Pope Leo the Tenth,—all of them enlightened and able men—when they strove to check the flood of the reformation? Were not such the thoughts of those, who about half a century ago, discouraged the effects of the pious and indomitable men—Whitfield, Wesley, and their followers—who felt conscientiously bound to apply extraordinary and irregular means, to remedy an extraordinary state of deadness in the Church, 'and who succeeded through the blessing of God, in kindling a flame, which we all trust will never be put out? Ah! my friends it has been by those, who have surrendered earthly comfort and human power, and have "broken away," "Every man from his master" that this world has been most largely blessed, and our own country has been most abundantly strengthened.

Consider, dear friends, that the case of Nabal is depicted as a warning. He perished miserably. And what, think you, shall be the end of the enemies of the true David, the true and only rightful King of Israel?

But, you may say, "we are not inimical, we are only indifferent." Indifferent! Is *truth*, ETERNAL truth, a matter of indifference; or if it be, is the cause of the Lord's people, a matter of indifference. Hear the words of Him who spake as never man spake. "*He that is not with me is against me, and that gathereth not with me, scattereth.*" (Luke xi. 23.) Indifference in the cause of God, is Treason against the Majesty of Heaven. If it be true that the *righteous* SCARCELY shall be saved, (1 Peter iv. 18)—what shall be the lot those, who like Gaius, see the Lord's people injured, and help them not, and "care for none of these things?"

"There be many servants who break away every one from his master!"—So said poor Nabal! In truth, David was then his rightful master, though he knew it not. Are you sure, my friends, that the Free Church is not really the ancient Church of your fathers, and that in refusing to join it, you are not yourselves the servants who actually are breaking away? Are you sure that the Residuary Church, is not in fact the Schismatical one, and the Free Church is not in fact an unaltered one? By whom have principles been changed? By the Free Church? No. It is now the Free Church; it is now severed from the State, *because* it would *not* alter, because it would *not* surrender blood bought charters, and time honored rights. You talk of schismatics; like Nabal you speak, it may be, of servants breaking away from their master—but beware, lest to each of you the word be spoken, "THOU art the man."

Oh! you say, do not trouble me about the matter; it is a frivolous



and unimportant question between the parties. You think it is no doctrine, nothing essential. Indeed ! Is it not enough for you to remember, *who* have thought it a principle worth suffering poverty for,—our old divines who espoused it, Rutherford, and Haliburton, our late divines Boston, Brown and Erskine, our present goodly band, Chalmers, and Gordon, McFarlane and Keith, Duncan and Welsh? Or if this be not enough, then let me ask, why in the first Book of Discipline these words were inserted by Knox? “*It appertaineth to the people and to every several congregation to elect their own minister.*” Why was it that in the second Book of Discipline, one of the greatest standards of our Church, these words were inserted by Knox, Melvill, Erskine of Dun, and all the great and good of our country, “*it is to be eschewit, that no person be intrusit in any of the offices of the Kirk, contrary to the will of the congregation to whom they are appointed, and without the voice of the eldership?*” What is the plain common sense explanation of this principle. Simply this : that it is unreasonable to expect good, to ensue from a parlor relationship, instituted against the will of the hearers.

But the state ordered this relationship to be instituted in Marnoch, Auchterarder and Cusalmond, and “the state’s orders must be obeyed.” If so, then why did the Apostles not obey, when commanded to preach no more in the hallowed name of Jesus ; why did not Luther and Knox obey the Popes, and Emperors, and Queens, who wanted to crush them? Your principle, my friends is unsound. We must render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s—not other things ; but to God the things that are God’s. Christ’s ministers, *are* Christ’s ministers, not the State’s ; and Christ, therefore, they must obey. And is it obedience to Him, to place over his flock, not shepherds but wolves, not acceptable and useful men, but men who cannot be useful, who are dreaded, and shunned, and by too many, are despised? Are men’s *souls* thus to be trifled with?

Well then, you reply, all this may be true, but the secession is no longer necessary, because Lord Aberdeen’s Bill has established the rights of the Kirk. Strange fancy ! Am I dreaming, when I say that *since* the secession, there has been practical proof that the Kirk is still unprotected? that an unacceptable minister has been forced on the parishioners of Auchterarder ; that *since* Lord Aberdeen’s bill passed, an intrusion of an unacceptable minister has been threatened in the town of Banff? and that the Civil Courts have interdicted the preaching of the Gospel in a large part of the Island of Skye, including even “the highways and lanes thereof”? Look, my friends, look to *facts* ; look to “moderate” Presbyteries armed by Lord Aberdeen, with arbitrary power ; look at the Civil Courts without any restriction on their publication of interdicts like *that*, look at these things, and be deceived more !

Are you confident that in opposing the Free Church, you are not “*forsaking your own mercies?*” As David said to Nabal, so may the Free Churchmen say to you, “*thy shepherds which were with us, we hurt not, neither was there ought missing unto them, all the while they*

*were in Carmel.*" Yes ! it was under the Free Churchmen that religion revived, that the shepherds were made vigilant and faithful, that the sheep were recovered and secured. Education, district visiting, Church Extension, many new pious ministers, missions, tracts, bible circulation—all, in fact, that has made Scotland what she is, all came from them. And now they have given up hearth and home, and income, rather than surrender the Christian rights of their people ; they have carried out their ancient Kirk from beneath the shadow of the kingly favor, which was killing it like the upas tree ; and *you* remain behind, not only taunting the seceders as schismatics, but adhering to ministers, who much more truly are schismatical. Oh ! my friends, think of what Christian sympathy and your own best interest demand ; think of the history of the past, think of the prospects of the future. Join us ere it be too late, join us with thankfulness and zeal—yea, "*Come with us, and we will do you good.*"

I am yours in Christian affection,

A. B.

#### IV.—CORRESPONDENCE OF SCOTTISH MISSIONARIES IN INDIA WITH THE CHURCH AT HOME.

##### I.—LETTER FROM THE REV. DR. WILSON OF BOMBAY TO THE REV. DR. WELSH, CONVENER, &c. EDINBURGH.

*Smyrna, June 19, 1843.*

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—I was appointed one of the representatives of the Church in India to the General Assembly which met in May last ; but my interesting and important engagements in connection with the founding of the mission to the Jews in the Holy Land, prevented me from being present with my fathers and brethren on that memorable occasion. Had the case been otherwise, I should certainly have been constrained by a sense of imperative duty, though with mournful feeling, and, I trust, without any breach of charity to those differing with us in opinion, to join in that solemn and momentous protest with which the Assembly was opened—a protest which, I believe, has been approved by the great Head of the Church in heaven, and which will never be forgotten by the Church militant on earth. I now embrace the earliest opportunity afforded to me, of signifying, through you, my adherence to the Free and Protestant Church of Scotland, and my acceptance of office under it as a missionary to India, on the condition offered by itself at its first General Assembly,—that I occupy the same sphere of duty and of labour in which it has been heretofore my privilege to move.

Though I take this important step under the firmest persuasion of its rectitude and propriety, I cannot but be deeply affected in the view of my official separation from many friends of the missionary cause who have not yet seen it their duty to abandon the legal religious establishment of our native land ; and I feel it incumbent on me to state to you in particular, that, I can never forget, or lightly estimate, my obligations, and those of

every missionary in India, to the more than paternal kindness, effective zeal, and singular promptitude, judgment and ability of the Rev. Dr. Brunton, so long the Convener of the General Assembly's Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign parts.

It was a question in Christian economics, which arose in connection with missions to the Gentile world, which gave rise to the first Synod of the Christian Church which was ever held; and the propagation of the gospel throughout the world is the grand duty of the Church. Freed as the ministers and elders of the Protestant Church of Scotland now are from many embarrassments which restrained their action, and from many exhausting contests for the independence and purity of the Church, and the rights and privileges of its members which they were compelled to wage, they will be enabled, it is to be hoped, to devote themselves to the discharge of this duty with a power of counsel and energy of devotedness hitherto unexampled, and for the effective operation of which our form of Church government is so favourable. I indulge the hope that they will not only maintain and strengthen, but multiply our posts in our great and wondrous empire in the East, and extend their benevolent regard to many other regions of the earth on which the Sun of Righteousness has not yet arisen with healing under His wings. The mighty efforts which require to be made for the diffusion of the gospel in the vast field at home, must not be pleaded as an excuse for feeble efforts in the immeasurable field abroad. We are in a state of safety and of soundness as spiritual men and a united Church, only when we exercise *all* the functions with which we are endowed, when we seek to discharge *all* our duties to the Gentile, Jew, and professing Christian.

Looking at the great desirableness of our having an approved model Church to which to direct the attention of the beloved individuals who have been reclaimed from heathenism in India by our instrumentality as evangelists, I do rejoice that we can point their attention to that with which we shall now be most intimately connected, both as it claims the homage of a nation to the cause of Christ, which, in the event of the general Christianization of our people and rulers, will not be withheld to the extent to which it may be found necessary,—and as it maintains inviolate its own spiritual independence and forth-flowing privileges, and exercises all its functions as they are conferred and established by the Lord Jesus Christ, who has given His own word to unfold and exemplify the principles by which it is. His will that His own house should be regulated. I frankly confess, that of our late system of patronage, I was always ashamed in the presence of our children in the faith. I should as soon be accessory to the marriage of my daughter to a mass of animal matter against her own will and without her own consent, as to the ordination of a pastor over a reclaiming and protesting people; and clearly as I perceive that it would not be reckoned a sufficient reason for consummating a marriage that the special objections of a daughter, (most interested in her own future destiny,) to an individual proposed as a husband by even a considerate parent, should be adjudged groundless by that parent,—so clearly do I perceive that, while Christians are held responsible to God for those whom they hear, and have it as their own privilege to “look out” for “men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom,” to be appointed office-bearers in the Church by its ministers, they cannot on any reasonable grounds be required to forego their own choice or acquiescence in the settlement of a pastor. To make the Church of the living God dependent on the civil power of any country for the extent of its ecclesiastical liberties,—for the regulation of its discipline, the terms of its communion, the administration of its ordinances, and the consecration of its ministers, and the degree of authority which they shall exercise as endowed or non-endowed,—is to betray its best interests, and to constitute it a merely world-

ly institution. My conscience does not permit me to homologate in any degree the claims of a mistaken government in this matter, so intimately connected with the glory of the great Head of the Church, and the spiritual welfare of those whom He has purchased with His own blood; and lest I should be found sinning against that God, by whose word and Spirit I humbly trust that conscience is directed, I leave that Establishment with which I have hitherto reckoned it an honour and a privilege to be connected and adhere to, and cast in my lot with those who have gone forth unto Christ without the camp bearing his reproach. In doing this, I trust that through divine grace we shall ever be enabled to maintain and propagate our principles without any compromise, and at the same time seek to remove from us all the corruptions which may be still cleaving to us. The following passage of the divine Word has been strongly impressed on my mind as applicable to our circumstances:—"If thou return then, I will bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before me: and if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth: let them return unto thee; but return not thou unto them."

Praying that the Lord may enable us to fear none of those things which we may suffer, but to be faithful unto death, and that at last He may give us a crown of life,—I am, &c.,

JOHN WILSON.

## 2.—LETTER FROM ONE OF THE CALCUTTA MISSIONARIES.

[Original lost in the "Memnon" Steamer.]

"Whither thou goest, I will go—and where thou lodgest, I will lodge:  
"Thy people shall be my people—and thy God, my God."

Ruth 1. 16.

Calcutta, July 4th, 1843.

REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER,—The communication which as convener of the "Provisional Committee of Ministers and Elders" in Edinburgh, you addressed to the Revd. Dr. Duff, as Senior Member of our Mission, I have seen, and with much interest perused. It is a document marked by a considerate humble, affectionate spirit; and whatever official or collective answer may be made to it by my brethren, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of an individual reply, in which to express the fullness of my heart.

With a late departed brother amongst you, I can truly say, that I do habitually give thanks to my Lord Jesus Christ that I "live in testifying times"—and as a sojourner in a far country I can also in sincerity say, that if ever the shadow of a wish to visit "Home" entered my heart, it has been that I might bear my share of testimony for those grand, glorious, eternal and universal principles—The Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the spiritual Freedom of His Body the Church. I have sympathized with the esteemed and beloved brethren for whom you write, in all their contendings for those first principles; and I trust that, by the grace of God, I am now ready to share in their sufferings and sacrifices for the Lord Jesus Christ and His Church's sake.

It is unnecessary for me to trouble you, amidst your manifold correspondence, with any further declaration of my sentiments; what I have said

will assure you, that I do (to use your own words) "adhere to the Church in her separation from the Establishment;" and that, whether many or few have separated themselves, I am ready to share God's providence towards them.

Meanwhile, until we hear what arrangements are made in regard to our missionary field and labour here, I shall co-operate with my brethren in carrying on our usual work: for it must rest *with you at home* to consider and determine what is to become of the vast *Trust* here committed to our charge.

May the "Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," who hath your "government on His Shoulders," be your Guide even as He is your glory!

In the bonds of the cross and of the crown,

Your's very faithfully,

\* \* \* \* \*

*Missy. Minister.*

## V.—HOME INTELLIGENCE AND MISCELLANEOUS SELECTIONS.

### 1.—THE SEPTEMBER MAIL.

The public mind in Scotland is recovering from the intense excitement of former months; but there is no trace whatever of abating energy or flagging zeal on the part of the Free Church, in prosecuting the measures needful for her permanent institution. On the contrary. The season of comparative quiet after such conflict and agitation, appears to be, if possible, that of more deliberate counsel and determined effort. "The cause of the Free Church" writes Dr. Chalmers to a minister in Ireland, "has grown upon our hands beyond all calculation. The pressure is so universal, that there is scarcely any one among us left to assist another." There is something even in the public records which we have, of the doings of the Church's Committees and Sub-Committees—taking into view also the journeyings hither and thither in deputations, and the multifarious speeches and writings of the leading men—there is something that seems almost superhuman in the performances indicated, when we think of the amount of mind that has been laid under contribution, and also note the spirit of sound wisdom and discretion in which every effort is made, as well as the spirit of untiring zeal and love. The prospects of congregations unprovided with proper Church accommodation, as winter approaches, become more and more anxious: for the demand for spiritual instruction and the ordinances of grace is increasing unprecedently just as the difficulty of supply is greatest. "It is most encouraging," says the writer of a private letter before us, a Free Church Minister's wife, "in this quarter (Perthshire), and indeed it is so more or less over the land, to see the

eager and awakened attention with which multitudes, formerly indifferent, now listen to the ministrations of the cast-out servants of Jesus." Our readers have already seen an account of the astonishing work of the Holy Spirit in the Isle of Skye. He will find in our present Number a similar narrative of which St. Kilda is the scene.\* We cannot pause in our brief summary to remark on these things as we fain would. But we entreat our readers to make this subject not only a matter of meditation, but of earnest prayer, and of holy joy and thanksgiving. The spiritual appetite—the "hungering and thirsting after righteousness"—is the Divine work in the soul; it is the most glorious and most gracious token of God's love and favor; nor does He ever so deny Himself as to implant that best of desires, without purposing also its blissful satisfaction. "Yet for all this will he be enquired of." Alas, how apt are we ever to forget that!—and to pervert the most precious promises into excuses for supineness or indolence, instead of using them as pleas in more fervent prayer, and as motives to more devoted obedience. But we must be brief.

Lord Aberdeen's Scotch Church Bill has past into Law by a narrow Parliamentary majority, having been previously approved in the Commission of the Residuary Assembly in Edinburgh, by a majority of only 28 in a House of 94. Such is the acceptability in quarters even where the minister is all-paramount, of this most extraordinary specimen of legislation!

Lord Campbell has also signalized himself and the cause of Moderateism, by bringing in a Bill which might be fitly entitled—"A Bill to prevent the Moderates of St. Andrew's University from making themselves ridiculous by expelling their Principal, Sir David Brewster, merely because he has become a Free Churchman." Lord Haddington on the part of Her Majesty's Ministry, opposed the Bill however, as if, to his mind, its appropriate preamble should have run thus—"A Bill to allow that distinguished Philosopher, Sir D. Brewster, a twelvemonth to repent of his folly in adhering to the Free Church." Lord Lyndhurst opposed the Bill, because it was a breach of the Treaty of Union!—of which there could be no doubt; and Lord Campbell for that very same reason, *justified* the Bill!—and because the Treaty of Union had been broken already, argued that it might be broken again!! to which exquisite argument Lord L. prudently attempted no reply. At length the Bill was withdrawn without a division. Was there ever such legislation as this witnessed in any country?

Leaving these scenes—let us turn to some more refreshing. The Church, at the earnest solicitations of friends in many quarters, has sent Deputations of her Ministers and Elders to England; and we have accounts of their enthusiastic reception in many places. Notwithstanding the peculiar circumstances, and very distinctive character of her ecclesiastical rule, England generally is becoming at last sensible

\* We find we have not room to spare for this intended extract.

of the great fact that the national Church of Scotland has been cast out by the State for nothing less than attachment to *Religious Liberty* and the *Rights of Conscience*. These at least are things, and they are also watchwords, intelligible enough to English minds and ears. In many of the towns, the Mayors presided at the public meetings; and Wesleyans, Congregationists, and Baptists have all taken part in the proceedings. We see that the contributions in favor of the Free Church, from England, are expected to amount to £30,000, and from Ireland, to £10,000. There was a crowded and most impressive Meeting held even in Cork, notwithstanding the rival excitements of Repeal and the visit of the British Association for Science. A short extract from a letter from Bristol will serve as a specimen of the welcomes with which our Deputations have been every where greeted:—

"I congratulate those of my fellow-citizens who were present at the Public Rooms on Tuesday evening, on the treat they were privileged to enjoy, in listening to the truly eloquent and heart-stirring statements made by the deputation from the Free Church of Scotland. If we may regard that deputation as a fair specimen of the body it represented, we can scarcely marvel at the mighty results which are being wrought out in the land of 'John Knox and his heroic band;' for we have seldom listened to men who, in the setting forth of their case, evinced a greater simplicity of purpose, or a more dignified bearing. Many have anxiously watched the noble struggle which has for years been going forward on the other side of the Tweed; and perhaps no struggle has had about it elements and features of a more momentous order since the glorious battle of the Reformation; indeed, in one particular (the solemn protest borne by the members of the Free Church of Scotland against all secular control in the spiritual affairs of Christ's kingdom), that struggle may be viewed as an advance upon the Reformation itself. Oh, it is a sublime and refreshing thing—one that does our hearts good in these days of semi-Popish pretension and Erastian policy—to see a nation standing out boldly, in the true spirit of the Covenanters of old, for the sole Kingship of Christ in his Church,—to see five hundred ministers sacrificing their worldly interests, and abandoning their pulpits in the Church of their fathers, as an act of homage to the sacred claims of conscience,—to see eight-tenths of the religious community of a land upholding, by their noble and disinterested conduct, the independence and spirituality of the gospel kingdom. May God grant to them, in this holy fight, the courage which His blessing only can inspire; and may God render the Free Church of Scotland his instrument in carrying on that war of principle which shall issue in the overthrow of all unscriptural establishments, and in leaving religion to the native force of its own heaven-born and resistless energy. It is confidently expected that the friends connected with all the free religious communities of Bristol will help their brethren of the Free Church of Scotland, in their noble efforts to raise the three hundred thousand pounds requisite for the building of their *seven or eight hundred new churches*. It would reflect great discredit on the Dissenters of our city if they were to hold back on so grand an occasion. It may most surely be said that the deputation did, to the crowded assembly that hearkened to them, and to the cause of religious freedom in this city, more good, by their truly manly, Christian, soul-stirring statements, than can be repaid by any pecuniary bestowments; and it may be safely predicted that, should the Revd. James Begg and D. M. Makgill Crichton, Esq. again visit Bristol, no building in it will be found sufficiently large to hold the thousands that will throng to hear them. I do hope that this is but the first of a series of such visitations from our other-side-the-border friends."—*Correspondent of the Bristol Mercury.*

And the following Resolution at a Meeting of the Independents in Southampton, will also show the manner and spirit of the solicitations

which have been addressed to the Fathers of our Church in Scotland inviting these deputations :—

*“Resolved—That this Church, having long watched with great solicitude the efforts of the seceding members of the Established Church of Scotland to secure the independence of the ecclesiastical corporation from the evils arising from secular control in the administration of its affairs, would hereby express its deep sympathy with them in the struggles through which they have passed in the attempt to accomplish that object, and also their high admiration of the faith, integrity, and self-sacrificing resolution upon which they have acted in abandoning the stations which they had occupied in the Established Church when those efforts failed ; thereby declaring, in the most solemn manner, their protest against the evils which they sought in vain to remove ; and adopting the most scriptural and effective means to accomplish, more fully, the independence, spirituality, and consequent triumph, of that branch of the true Church of Christ to which they belong. The aforesaid Church at Southampton does also hereby express its readiness to receive a deputation from the reverend body of seceding ministers, some time in the approaching month of September, to plead the cause of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, in the sanctuary in which they worship ; and offers them the assurance that such deputation will be received with brotherly affection and encouraged by corresponding support.”—Patriot.*

The Duke of Sutherland persists in his infatuated refusal to give sites for Free Churches throughout his vast domains. Sir George Munro of Poyntzfield having granted a site in the parish of Dornoch, the Duke's local agents immediately stuck up printed placards over the town, peremptorily prohibiting the removal of stones from the Dornoch quarry for that purpose ! The effects of the Duke's policy may be seen from the following extracts of a letter written on the spot :—

“The minister of Assynt has removed with his family to Tain, upwards of fifty miles from the sphere of his labours, having been denied a church or residence in his wide and destitute parish. The aged minister of Lairg leaves his parish immediately in quest of a house. The minister of Duirness has removed to Thurso, seventy miles distant. The venerable minister of Tongue and the minister of Edrachilles are removing to the same place. The minister of Stoer has gone to Arran with his family. The expatriation of clergymen from this country, who prefer their integrity to all else, is very nearly triumphant. The country for hundreds of miles is a spiritual wilderness, even those parts of it which were but lately a well-watered garden ; and thousands are left destitute, not only of pastoral ministration, but bereaved of the “joyful sound” of the gospel trump entirely. But have the people made shipwreck of their principles ? they are firmer and more determined than ever. Should the gospel be proscribed there, and even the land depopulated, the very stones will rise up to witness against the cruel policy now pursued.”

Macleod of Macleod, the high Chief of Dunvegan, disturbed by the rude encroachment of Public Opinion on his ancient feudal right to do with his own as he pleases—has been forced to the humiliation of addressing a letter to the Newspapers, *explaining* his late application to the Court of Session *to interdict all preaching whatever, save that of the Residuary Clergy, in any parish of his estates*, as having proceeded simply from his desire to protect his poor tenants from having their “farms poached on by the poxies turned loose to graze on them !” Simple-minded chieftain—to imagine that such an enormous absurdity could be swallowed by a sensible public ! We shall be amused to see what the Court of Session may make of it.



In happy contrast with these and a few other instances of the same kind, we read of many of the landed gentry giving sites for Free Churches on their estates. Lord Aberdeen's liberality in this respect is to his credit—the only *amende* in his power now for the fearful wrongs he has inflicted on his country—the tears he has wrung from many a pious and gentle heart turned out of many a happy home—the pangs of social and domestic and pastoral ties severed by the ruthless hand of the Law—that new, unjust, unfeeling and unconstitutional Law which *he might have arrested* in its mad destructive career, but which on the contrary he encouraged and aided with all his personal and political influence !

The relaxation in this course of feudal oppression, which is now observable—appears greatly attributable to the timely publication of the following powerful and dignified remonstrance in the form of a Minute of the Commission of the Free Church General Assembly :—

*Minute of the Special Commission of the Free Church of Scotland, held at Edinburgh, August 8th, 1843.*

The Special Commission of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland deem it their duty, at this eventful crisis, to call the attention of land-owners in Scotland, and other persons of wealth and influence, to various representations that have been made to them from different parts of the country.

The Commission have learned, on undoubted authority, that in some cases proprietors of land have refused sites for building places of worship for that part of the population who have avowed their attachment to the principles of the Free Church ; that in other cases servants and other dependents have been dismissed from their situations, and thrown on the wide world, on no other ground but that they have seen it their duty to leave the Establishment ; that the cottagers in some parishes have been warned, at their peril, not to shelter, even for a night, under their humble roofs, the ministers who have left their manse for conscience' sake ; and that in one instance an interdict has been applied for to prevent a minister from preaching on a certain estate, or on the sides of the roads and highways that pass through it. Even in the present heated state of the public mind on Church matters, some of these statements may appear incredible to many, and it is not without some feelings of reluctance and shame that they are now brought under public notice.

The Commission do not, and cannot, dispute the entire right in law of every landowner to do what he wills with his own ;—he may level every homestead to the ground ; and he may so deteriorate the soil as to render his estate a barren waste. Every man is, of course, entitled to retain or dismiss his servants on any ground he pleases. The trustees on a highway have unquestionably a legal control over the wayside, so as to hinder a minister from standing on it to preach the gospel, or the people sitting on it to hear him ; and the man of wealth, perhaps, infringes on no statute, when he tells the cottagers on his property whom they are to receive, and whom they are to refuse to admit into their dwellings, for they are tenants at will, to whom he may feel himself entitled to prescribe the conditions on which they are to live on his domains. But a man may act within the limits of statutory right, and yet the question may still remain, how far the course he is pursuing is righteous in the sight of God and man.

The ministers and members of the Free Church of Scotland have left the Establishment purely on conscientious grounds ; and, whatever others may think of their prudence in doing so, it is hoped that at least their sincerity will not be called in question. They desire to live in peace with all men, and they cordially wish for the welfare of all who love the Saviour in sincerity, however they may differ from them in other matters. They are desirous to make all the provision in their power for the religious instruction of that portion of the people of Scotland who hold their principles ; and in renouncing all connection with the Estab-

blishment, and in every subsequent step they have taken towards forming themselves into a separate communion, they conceive themselves to be only exercising that liberty of conscience which is the gift of God to every man, and which is peculiarly the birthright of every Briton. They ask no special favour; they claim for themselves no other privileges than those which are granted to all other denominations of Christians in this country. They know, indeed, that the Lord of the conscience will reckon with them for all they have recently done; but no man, they conceive, can rightfully attempt to disturb or annoy them in what they regard as the course of present duty; and any attempt to do so would, they submit, be all the more strikingly unjust, if practised under colour of law.

A proprietor of many parishes cannot claim a right so to mould the minds of his tenantry, as that they may take the stamp of his religious opinions. Any endeavour on his part to do so would be as hopeless as it would be sinful. They may be as diligent in their callings as he could wish; he may know with heartfelt satisfaction that in their dwellings the Scriptures are often read, and that the duties of the family altar are not forgotten; and yet he may find that they do not agree with him entirely on the most important of all concerns. He may regret this; he may reason with them, but more he cannot with justice venture to do, for this plain reason, that he is not the Lord of their consciences. Legally he may remove them from his lands, or refuse them all means of worshipping God in the way and form that they think most scriptural, but his doing so would be an unjust attempt to rob them of a privilege which they have received from heaven. Many of the landowners of Scotland know the value of this privilege for themselves. They are Dissenters from the Church established by law in this part of the united kingdom, and they exhibit in their own persons examples of the right that every man has in this happy land, to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. Should any of this class control their inferiors in station or their dependents, when claiming the same spiritual liberty, will not an impartial world condemn them for such inconsistency and injustice?

Besides, any attempt to check the growth of religious opinions by such means, must obviously be unsuccessful. If the most unlettered peasant in our land is to be reclaimed from what we regard as error, it must be by an appeal to his understanding and heart. Any other appliances he justly regards as proclaiming the weakness of the cause that needs to be supported by such instruments; and while he will be alienated in affection from any one who can resort to such expedients he will be more riveted to the doctrine he has embraced. The history of Scotland has long ago proved, that the mere force of secular power cannot bury a religion, and that every effort to do so always leads to the most fatal results.

This is a view of the subject which the Commission would respectfully press on the attention of those for whom this Address is designed. Every man feels that religion is his own business, and even an indirect attempt on the part of the higher classes to interfere with the rights of conscience, will surely lead to a dislocation of the different orders of society. The recent separation of so many ministers and people from the Establishment on conscientious grounds, has already unavoidably created some feelings of alienation among the various classes in the community, which it will be difficult to remove. For this evil we cannot hold ourselves to be responsible, while we deeply deplore it; but we feel bound to state, that any attempt to hinder the people of this country in the free use of their spiritual liberties, must surely tend to aggravate the calamity in a tenfold degree. The inhabitants of Scotland have been long distinguished for their sober orderly character, and for their attachment to their religious institutions; and no efforts on our part will be wanting to cherish in their hearts feelings of loyalty to their Queen, and due respect for those who occupy the higher walks of life; but if their most sacred rights are in any case disregarded and trampled on, they cannot possibly entertain any feelings of regard to those who do so. It is earnestly hoped that a sense of what they owe to God and their fellow-men, will keep the industrious classes in this country from any of those excesses which have disgraced other parts of the kingdom; but we feel bound to state, that should the measures adopted towards them by some of the higher orders be persevered in, we fear a deep sense of wrong will unavoidably be kindled in their bosoms, and will be transmitted from generation to generation. Such a result

in the beginning of September :—his mission thither will be blessed by the Lord, we sincerely hope. The Foreign Mission Committee publishes several delightful letters from the Jewish Missionaries, who, we find, have in concurrence with Dr. Wilson of Bombay, selected Damascus as the future Head-quarters of their Mission. The letters from that distinguished Missionary, and also from his brethren at Bombay, giving in their adherence—have greatly cheered the Church at home. They are aware, long ere this, to their further joy, that *every one* of their Missionaries abroad, has proved equally faithful. When we regard the position in which our Church is now placed, in the view of all nations and Churches—her supports, encouragements and consolations, from without as well as within—together with her immense difficulties, discouragements and dangers ;—the intense and various opposition she has to encounter—yet the prodigious energies, the fervent piety, the perfect unanimity, of her leaders ; the personal trials, sufferings, and privations, especially of her ministers and their impoverished families, and of the poor members of her flocks, preferring a clear conscience to all worldly interests—and their un murmuring and forgiving patience, fidelity and devotion ;—when we see a Church thus contending, but thus triumphing,—struggling as it were for her very existence, and at the same moment overawing with her mere up-lighted finger, the persecuting spirit of a landed aristocracy—discountenanced and cast out by the State, scoffed at and belied by a godless world, hated as the Reformation itself was hated, by the advancing Popery of the age—yet faithful to her Lord, honored by all whom He honors, and mightily blessed as His instrument of good to perishing souls—Who can witness such a spectacle as this nor exclaim,—It is the LORD's doing and wondrous in our eyes ! “ Troubled on every side, yet not overwhelmed ; perplexed but not in despair ; persecuted, yet not forsaken ; cast down, but not destroyed ; chastened, yet not killed ; grieved, yet greatly rejoicing ; poor, yet making many rich.” Such was the ancient Reformed Church of Scotland when she first took for her symbol, the “ burning bush,” and the motto *Nec tamen Consumebatur* ; and such, thank God, appears the Free Church of Scotland even at this hour.

We conclude our sketch by giving two short letters which we extract from the “ Witness : ” both of them appearing to us of interest, as being solitary specimens of their respective kinds. One of these is an act of withdrawal from the Free Church ; we are happy to say, the first—and we hope it may prove the last—illustration of such infirmity of principle :—

9, Dundas Street, Kingston, 22d July, 1843.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I have the pleasure of intimating to you, as Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow, that on Monday last eight days, I withdrew my adherence to the “ Free Protestant Church of Scotland,” and that as I have never been cited before your Presbytery on the subject of that adherence, I now regard myself as holding the status which I had well nigh forfeited all right to, viz. a minister of the Church of Scotland.

You will of course do whatever you consider right with this communication ; and with much regret that I should for so short a period ever have fallen into the sin of schism (!) I remain, Rev. Sir, yours faithfully,

HUGH M'CALMAN,

*Minister of the Seaman's Chapel.*

TO THE REV. P. BROWN,

*Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow.*

The other letter, is one of kind and approving sympathy from a venerable Episcopalian nobleman, the Earl of Roden :—

*"Tullymore Park, August 19, 1843.*

"DEAR SIR.—I am ashamed to see your letter so long unanswered ; but a great press of public as well as private business, and absence in London, must plead my excuse. I assure you no one can more entirely sympathize with those good men, who, for conscience' sake, have left house, and home, and Kirk, than I do ! and I wish it was in my power to contribute more largely to your fund for building churches, in which they might preach the gospel of Christ. But I am grieved to say the demands upon me in this country, of various kinds, keep me very bare. I enclose you a check for ten pounds, as a token of my good will, if it is worth having ; and hoping that a great blessing may attend the movement, by the spreading of the gospel far and wide, I am, dear Sir, your faithful servant,

"RODEN.

*"To the Rev. James Shields, Newry."*

The uniqueness of this last document consists in its being **THE ONLY** expression of approbation, admiration, or Christian sympathy of any kind, from any member or members of the Church of England, lay or clerical, towards our Church, which we find a record of in this whole month's newspapers—teeming as they are with records of that nature from sections of every other Protestant Church within hearing of her. We merely state what we observe *as a fact*—and if our observation be correct, we think it a very sad and humbling fact, as regards the Church of England herself : as regards the Free Church of Scotland, it is a fact that concerns her no more than it may any other Evangelical Church upon earth. We frankly confess our own utter inability to comprehend the ground on which the evangelical party in the Church of England now take their stand. Puseyism has undeniably beat them out of every hold and fastness of mere *Churchism*—as understood in the Vatican and at Lambeth. They appear to be stunned (as well they may be) at the privileged advances of that fearful heresy, planting its every step on grounds which, if not scriptural, are at least Church-of-England grounds, and therefore not to be gainsayed by one evangelical minister as long as he remains within her pale. And they are silenced accordingly—or they utter but feeble lamentations—or speak timid disapprobation :—or if at any time loud in faithful advocacy of their own higher and better views of Gospel Truth, marring their own work the very next day perhaps, by acts of the most fatal concession to their opponents, and of inconsistency enough to make "angels weep." And what shall the end of these things be, if such be the conduct even of the best watchmen still found, slumbering while they should be guarding with

intensest and united efforts, the walls of the so-called Protestant Church to which they adhere? That these views of the state of that Church are universally entertained by all *without her pale*, is not to be questioned: nor is it sectarian antipathy, or national jealousy, which lead to them. See what an able and intelligent New York Journal wrote on it only a month or two since:—

“So far as we can learn, from the English papers, the condition of this Church is truly perilous. The Scotch Church is on the verge of division from the assertion of an inalienable spiritual right, which is esteemed dearer than silver and gold; but there being less virtue in the English Church, the foulest heresy is overspreading it, and yet no one hears the voice of the Lord “My people come out of her.” There are no hundreds of clergymen in *her* communion, who are willing to resign their livings, rather than countenance by their presence, the successful march of Oxford heresy. The great mass of the clergy are already infected, and those who first embraced the system, are now standing on the dividing line, which separates their Church from Rome, and some have actually gone over. There is no discipline in the English Church. All are safe, no matter what may be their sentiments, provided they hold the divine right of Episcopacy. The Evangelical clergy, who appear to be a very small party, can only sigh and mourn; they can do nothing effectually; the power is in the hands of the diocesans, who are very careful never to exercise it in rooting out heresy.”

The apparent insensibility of the true friends of religion in the English Church, to her real danger, and to their own duty in view of it, is in fact as fatal a symptom of her condition as could be. The enemy has come in like a very flood on her; and the “Charges” of one or two pious Bishops here and there, neutralized by the unmerited compliments or inconsistencies, which in every instance without exception (none more glaring than in the Diocese of Calcutta), have either accompanied or followed them—these have been the only standards lifted up against him by the Church as a Church: and to what effect? The occasional writings and sermons of individuals have been valuable as personal testimonies to the Truth contested; these writers have acquitted their own consciences, so far, but they are all poor *Churchmen* just in proportion as they are consistent *CHRISTIANS*. Their services in this cause, are not the acts of the Church; they are in too many particulars in direct contradiction to her authoritative Standards. What then—we again ask sorrowfully—what shall the *END* of these things be?

The above remarks had already gone to press when we received one or two other Papers of later (the very latest) dates—from which we must make the following interesting extracts, limited though our space is. The first is a quotation from the “*Oxford Chronicle*,” referring to the Queen’s Speech on proroguing Parliament. This extract speaks for itself:—

“The Queen is made to express her satisfaction at the passing of the Act for removing doubts respecting the jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland, regarding the appointment of ministers; and her Majesty is made to express the earnest hope, that this Act will restore religious peace to Scotland.

"Her Majesty can only speak as advised by her Ministers, but we cannot but marvel at the indecent freedom of Ministers in making the Queen express her hope in the restoration of religious peace, and the removal of dangers which threatened the Established Church of Scotland, by means of an act, which is passed months after the religious peace of that Church has been broken, and four hundred ministers, the strength and glory of the Establishment, gone from it, and formed a "Free Church," which, it is now evident, will include the vast majority of the people, and leave the legal Establishment a body without a soul, a mere pretence and phantom. We repeat, that it was an indecent freedom in Ministers to put such language,—*language contrary to fact and to reason*,—into the mouth of their royal mistress, to be uttered before the world."

Our readers probably know, in a general way, that Sir George Sinclair has of late years been a very busy gentleman in Church of Scotland politics : a man whose misfortune it is, to be possessed of very considerable talents, and of most estimable private character, in conjunction with one fatal infirmity—an unsteadiness in aim and purpose, a vacillation, an inconstancy, a love of change—a something, call it what you may, in consequence of which "no man knows where to have him"—and that has landed him now, (in the meridian of life,) notwithstanding all advantages of birth, station and character, among shoals from off which no breath of popular applause, or ministerial favor, can ever again waft him into usefulness—far less into any thing like greatness. This is the accomplished and amiable man who was the contemporary of Byron and of Sir Robert Peel at Harrow—and whom the former described as—"the prodigy of the School." "George Sinclair beat us all hollow ; we all predicted that he would be Prime Minister some day." This man of many gifts, and *only* lacking the talent of turning them to account, was one whose "pettifogging negotiations" with Lord Aberdeen above all other interference damaged of late years the cause of our much wronged Church. He wrote 'many bitter things' against her at last—cheered on Lord Aberdeen in his fatal policy against her—nor relaxed his most unaccountable hostility until the Establishment was overthrown. Behold what Sir George says and thinks *now*, of those men whom he has been instrumental in turning forth with their helpless families on their country's charity for needful shelter, food and raiment ! Let us see in what language Sir George expresses himself *now*, of that Church which he and his "amiable friend Lord Aberdeen" have been chief agents in overthrowing ! And when we read the tribute wrung from such an unwilling yet such a thoroughly competent witness as Sir George Sinclair, to the popularity of the Free Church, and the piety of its members—it may not be uninteresting to compare it with the statements which appeared but a few days since, as a letter from Edinburgh, in the Calcutta "*Englishman*,"—a document, we may be allowed to remark, as full of inaccuracies (to speak gently), as any thing we have read for a long time. Our own pages already abound with authentic and official papers which expose not a few of these alleged facts—to expose them all would take up a volume. The writer however seems merely to be the credulous dupe of "*Blackwood*", for his *facts* are all borrowed from that Journal—the great organ of Moderatism in Scotland, as the *Times* is of Puseyism in England : both fit

advocates for two such causes—both being pre-eminent in the Periodical literature of the Age, for coarseness and virulence of invective, hatred of evangelical religion in every form, and when needful the most astonishing hardihood of assertion in the face of fact. One cannot read a *Blackwood* article on the Scotch Church, without pausing once and again to wonder at the kind of calculation which the writer must have made before he began, as to the extent of belief which his inventions would command for a time, and so serve his party's purpose, before they came to be exposed. What a Cause is that, which must lean on such advocacy!

Sir George first speaks of Lord Aberdeen's incomparable "healing measure" which has just passed into Law.

*Thurso Castle, 26th August, 1843.*

"I presume that your chief object in transmitting to me these documents was, to obtain an expression of my opinion, both as to Lord Aberdeen's bill, and as to the strictures which you have made on that enactment. To tell you the truth, I have long ceased to take any lively interest in its principles or provisions, and I have not met with any one in this neighbourhood, who seemed very desirous that it should pass, or much afraid that it might be rejected. The calamity, which I was indescribably anxious to avert, has taken place, and has not proved less awful in its results than I anticipated. The Church has lost an OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF ITS MOST ZEALOUS AND POPULAR MINISTERS—OF ITS MOST ACTIVE AND RESPECTED ELDERS—ITS MOST DEVOTED AND CONSISTENT COMMUNICANTS. Many of its edifices might, without any detriment to the cause of Divine truth, be demolished by fire or swallowed up by an earthquake; for, even if the preachers appointed to fill up the vacancies should be ever so eloquent or mighty in the Scriptures, I do not believe that they will, in any great number of instances, induce the followers of THE EXCELLENT MEN, who have quitted the Establishment, to return within its pale. For this most awful consummation, I HOLD THAT HER MAJESTY'S MINISTERS ARE IN NO SMALL DEGREE RESPONSIBLE. They turned a deaf ear to the advice and remonstrances of many of their best friends, and obstinately refused to make their intentions known until a period when they must have been aware that, without a complete sacrifice of character and principle, THE MOST USEFUL AND ESTEEMED MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH were pledged to withdraw from her communion, unless an adequate measure were previously introduced. To be sure, they have gained one triumph: they have succeeded in extinguishing the Veto; but have they not, at the same time, all but destroyed the Establishment itself? Their regard for that inestimable institution may, I think, be compared to that of the bear in the fable, who swore an eternal friendship with a hermit, in consequence of which, as soon as Bruin saw a fly molesting the recluse and settling upon his nose when asleep, he took up a ponderous stone and crushed the fly, but by the same blow cracked the hermit's skull also."

We conclude this unreasonably long Article, with the following truly graphic and cheering account of the progress of matters in one quarter of the country—Dumfries-shire: it is quoted from the *Witness* of 2d September. We believe an equally cheering account could also be given of two other districts as *barren* lately as even Dumfries-shire—Fifeshire, and Aberdeenshire, the very strongholds of Moderatism.

#### "PROGRESS.

It is well known that Dumfries-shire is one of the most intensely Moderate districts in Scotland—it holds that bad pre-eminence in the south which Aberdeenshire holds in the north. Men are there to be found of the genuine old school type, unmodified in principle or practice since the days of anti-missionary

debates in the General Assembly, and the putting down of Sabbath schools as nurseries of sedition.

We lately spent a Sabbath in that district, and worshipped in two of its Free Churches.—that is, twice in the open air,—and cannot soon forget the doings of the day. During the previous night a thunder storm had raged in the valleys of the Dryfe and the Annan. As the Sabbath morning dawned the rain fell heavily, but the thunder died away, and as the day advanced, the sun shone brightly out to gladden the homes of thousands. As we gazed on the quiet beauty of the scene, before the hour of worship, the most attractive of all its features were two Free Churches, about four miles apart, fast advancing to completeness, yet too slowly for the zeal of the adherents. In the broad open valley the two rivers were fast finding their way to the Solway; in the distance, on the one side, an ancient burgh, long famed for its Moderatism, which is now said to be dying of inanition, shut up the view; on the other, Skiddaw was seen reposing amid the vapours gathered round its base; and altogether the scene was one which forcibly suggested the thought—if the earth, after the curse which clothed it with thorns and thistles, be so exceeding fair, what must its beauty have been when God pronounced it good?

As the hour of worship approached, groupes of worshippers began slowly to move toward the village, as on communion days in the west and north of Scotland; and, strange to say, the equipage of affluence, as well as humbler conveyances, and hundreds a-foot, were moving forward to the common centre. The manse, half desolate, with its walks and flower-borders already covered with weeds,—its shrubberies tangled, and hastening to become a thicket,—an emblem of the spiritual desolation which many would spread,—gave a melancholy character to the whole. As it peeped out from its screen of venerable trees, it seemed to speak of unresisted oppression, and calmly to remind us that the sin of those who drove its happy occupants from that quiet home for conscience' sake, will yet find its authors out. It is near spots like this, hallowed by the associations of three hundred years, that we feel most deeply impressed with the conviction, that the measures which have violated the Constitution are also endangering the existence of the Established Church.

The place of worship was unique. It consisted of two courts attached to two contiguous cottages. The courts were divided from each other by a green hedge-row, at one end of which was placed the tent. The aged and the sickly found a screen beneath the hedge, or in the outhouses which flanked the inclosures, and thus did six or seven hundred people assemble to worship God, because they could not homologate the principles of the Establishment by worshipping in the adjoining church. As they crowded into the inclosures, there sat on many a countenance an air of thoughtful anxiety, such as men exhibit when conscious of being wronged, and yet uncertain to what these things may grow,—whether they are yet to gather deeper blackness, like the past night's thunderstorm, or clear away into sunshine, like the Sabbath that shone on them. In this parish the minister has abandoned the Residuary; and the result here, as elsewhere in the neighbourhood, has been, that nearly four out of every five have abandoned it with him.

The other church in which we worshipped was about four miles to the south of the former, in a holm on the banks of the Milk, lonely and sequestered as befitted the occasion. Here, as before, the people assembled in hundreds, though the parish minister had commenced an extraordinary and a rival service in the parish church. His new-born zeal seemed equally to amuse and astonish the neighbourhood, and the comparative attendance was a tolerably accurate index of the state of men's minds in the district. The proportion might be as four or five to one.

When we thought that scenes like these were to be witnessed in four or five hundred districts in Scotland, we could not but marvel at the doings of Him whose ways are a great deep. A few months ago, what would not have been given by some to secure an adjustment of the Church question, and an end of our strifes! The union, however, of Moderate and Evangelical ministers, was as incompatible as that of oil and water, and God has compelled a separation. The effects are beginning to be seen. Principle in abstraction is an evanescent



thing. Principle embodied in action is intelligible to all; and no conviction relating to the future can be more deeply rooted in our mind, than that, *if the Free Church of Scotland had ministers at her command, she could have a congregation in every seven miles of lowland country, within a year of the disruption.*

Even in the very Moderate districts we refer to, the progress of the Free Church is amazing. Starting, for instance, at Lockerbie, about seventy miles from the capital, we find there a Free Church about half erected, to accommodate that parish, and sections of those adjoining. About nine miles from Lockerbie, or Dryfesdale, we find the people at Wamphray,—the parish of the godly John Brown,—arranging with the adherents in Johnstone for the erection of a church to accommodate both, for the population of the one parish is only 509, of the other 1072. About four miles from Lockerbie, but not in the line of the highway, is Lochmaben, where a Free Church is nearly ready to be roofed in to accommodate that burgh, and contiguous portions of the adjoining parishes. Proceeding along the highway from Wamphray to Moffat, a distance of six miles and a half, we find a church nearly erected, and a minister already settled there accommodating the adherents in that parish, and the small parish of Kirkpatrick-Juxta. From Moffat, through Tweedsmuir, we find a blank of perhaps twenty miles, owing to the scattered nature of the population of that parish, amounting to only 276; but at Broughton we find a church nearly ready to be roofed in, to accommodate the adherents in that parish, with the upland districts of Drummelzier and Stobo. At a moderate distance to the west lies the parish of Skirling, where the new church will receive the population nearly to a man. At Kirkurd, in the line of the highway, a few miles from Broughton, the Free Church is far advanced towards completion. Then at Penicuik, we find a Free Church minister already placed; and, after many difficulties, arrangements for a church completed. A little to the right, Roslin Free Church is in progress. As we enter the city, Liberton Free Church is one of the first sights that greet us. And thus along a line of about seventy miles, we count nine churches nearly reared, and one at Wamphray on the eve of being so; and all this within three months and ten days of the disruption! Again, we say, principle embodied in action all can understand, and the people of Scotland have now demonstrated their fidelity to the Church of their fathers. We are far from supposing that our difficulties have been mastered; nay, the worst are yet to be encountered; and unless the friends of our cause bestir themselves, our troubles may speedily thicken. Reasoning, however, from the past to the future, we cherish the perfect confidence, that the hopes of our enemies will prove like those of the men of Nehemiah's time (iv. 3-6).

## 2.—DR. CHALMERS' SPEECH IN THE COMMISSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 31ST JANUARY, 1843.

[*The idea was at one time almost universally entertained in England, that the troubles of the Scotch Church were all attributable to the Veto Act of 1834, as "the sole and guilty cause;" and that its repeal would as a matter of course set all to rights again. This notion is now as generally exploded as it was once received: Sir R. Peel himself was among the first of his own party, who exposed its absurdity in the Senate. The following crushing Speech of Dr. Chalmers' had the merit of correcting this and one or two other obstinate blunders of the day. These are sometimes repeated still, however, with great confidence of assertion, in some of our Indian Journals,—for Truth does not travel always by Railway—and there can be no harm in our reprinting this Address now.*]

Dr. Chalmers rose and said,—Had there been any counter-motion, I should certainly have troubled the house at some length; but as there is no counter-motion, I shall be much more brief than otherwise I should have felt it my duty to be. I think our controversy is now in a fair way of being un-

derstood at last. This sententious Letter from the Home Office, with the Reply thereto which has been called forth from the Special Commission, must both greatly help forward that consummation. We have in them the manifesto of the State upon the one hand, and of the Church upon the other; and when these are rightly framed, all the irrelevancies and idle expressions of debate are cast overboard, and the original strong points of the argument on both sides are seized upon. I do not say, as I do not expect, that these closing stages of the warfare which has so long been going on, will cause our principles to find acceptance in the minds of those who are and always have been opposed to them. But my trust and hope is, that as the respective principles contended for,—as our principles and those of our opponents, are thus clearly recognised and read of all men, an honest public will deliver an impartial judgment and testimony,—will tell whether right and might have gone side by side in this controversy, or whether the might alone has not triumphed, and the right been over-borne. (Loud cries of Hear, hear.) There is one thing which I like exceedingly in this document of the Special Commission, which, I trust, will be adopted by this Commission,—and it is this, that the two questions of anti-patronage and spiritual jurisdiction have in it been so well and so admirably extricated, and placed on the separate foundations which undoubtedly belong to them. Nothing but mischief and mystification can result from the confounding of these two things. For, Sir, it ought ever to be borne in mind, that while the Church has only declared that she deems the one *desirable*, she has often and repeatedly declared, that she reckons the other wholly *indispensable*—that while, regarding the first, there obtain among ourselves all conceivable varieties of sentiment, it is not so with the other. Some of us only, for instance, regard popular election, the free election of ministers by the Christian people of the parishes over which they are to be placed, as our optimism; but with all of us a free independent jurisdiction in things ecclesiastical is a *sine qua non*. (Hear, hear, and applause.) I think, Sir, I would not have risen at this time, had not the Veto Law been brought so prominently into notice in the Letter from the Home Office, as I greatly wish at this last stage of our warfare to say a word or two regarding it. The idea seems to have got into the heads of our opponents, that the Veto Law has been the only source of all our difficulties, and that, therefore, we have ourselves to blame for these. Now this is a great, though a prevalent misconception. For do we not know, do our opponents not know, that IN THE ADVERSE SENTENCES OF THE CIVIL COURTS OF WHICH WE COMPLAIN, THE VETO LAW WAS NEVER HINTED AT OR HEARD OF? The proceedings adopted against us have not been adopted against us because of the Veto Laws, but because of our refusal to settle a minister in a parish when the majority of the Christian communicants of that parish declared that, from a regard to the good of their own souls, they could not receive him. *With or without the Veto Law* these sentences of the Civil Courts would have taken effect, for they have all been directed, not against the specific regulations of the Church on that subject, but against all the powers and privileges belonging to her. (Hear, hear.) There might have been no Veto Law,—the decision refusing to settle the presentee might have been given by the Presbytery of Auchterarder, and confirmed by the General Assembly, on other grounds altogether, but the same result would undoubtedly have followed. They might have refused the presentee, not because of the Veto Law, but because of the fundamental principle, that no minister be intruded on a reclaiming congregation contrary to their will,—or because of the deference they thought due to the voices and wishes of our honest god-fearing people; or, higher and more sacred still, because they thought that to force the settlement of a minister would be against, would be greatly prejudicial to, the Christian

good of the parish. And what I say is, that on whichever of these plans the decision of the Presbytery might have ostensibly been made to rest, the decisions of the Civil Courts, as repeatedly given forth and judicially explained, would strike equally at all, would set them all at naught. (Hear, hear.) This, Sir, is proved, or rather, I should say, demonstrated, not only by the original sentence itself, but also by the manner in which that sentence has been followed up. In other days the discovering of the temporalities from the cure would have been the only consequence of such a decision. But *now*, new consequences follow the adverse decisions of the Civil Courts according to the law as *now* declared, any where, and at any time, these Courts may visit any proceeding of ours, which they choose to lay their hands, with all the penalties of civil wrong! The old maxim that the king can do no wrong, has now, it would seem, descended from the throne, and been brought to the level of courts co-ordinate with ourselves—(Loud cries of hear, hear)—and the consequence is, that the Civil power is now walking at pleasure over the whole length and breadth of our domains. (Hear, hear, and great applause.) The repeal of the Veto Law, Sir! The Veto Law was but the opening, the occasion, for the first decision, which has been followed up by a series of the most monstrous aggressions, and now the work of violation is well nigh completed, in the subversion and destruction of all our liberties. (Great applause.) The innocent imagination of my friend Dr. Leishman—(laughter)—on this subject, is, I perceive, that if we but removed this Veto Law, and stepped back to the places which we occupied before it was passed, all would again be well. This, Sir, is certainly a very amiable thought—(great laughter)—that the repeal of the Veto Law would cancel all the Erastianism to which that law has given occasion,—an Erastianism, too, which has been fixed and settled by precedents in the judgment books of the House of Lords, and standing as indelibly there as if they had been graven with a pen of iron. No, Sir, we have other work on hand than the repeal of the Veto Law. (Loud applause.) Such a proceeding would be altogether useless and effete, and brings to my mind the homely yet forcible adage which speaks of “steiking the stable door when the steed’s stown.” Why, Sir, it is precisely as if, after the storming of a citadel through some unfortunate archway which the townsmen had erected some weeks before, and after the enemy had got possession of the fort and all its approaches, and were proceeding, not to murder, but, for the sake of your nerves, I will only say to handcuff the garrison—just as the Court of Session is now doing to our *quoad sacra* ministers—some one should propose, in order to stay all further procedure, and by way of making all right again, just to get back to where they were before, by going in a body and beating down the archway which they had erected,—just as my friend Dr. Leishman proposes we should beat down the Veto Law. Why, Sir, such a proceeding would have no effect whatever in the way of bringing about either the safety or enlargement of the Church, but would only serve to bring down upon us a shout of triumph from the high places of the land. That would be a truly wretched expedient to retrieve the disasters of our Church, which would but lay her open to the bitterest of derision from the very men, to please whom, she would resort to it. (Loud cries of hear, hear, and great applause.) But did not I myself at one time recommend the repeal of this very Veto Law? (Laughter.) Yes, Sir, I did,—I don’t deny that I did; and if people could only find room in their minds for more than one idea—(hear, hear)—if people could only combine one thing with another, they would find that what would have done every thing for us then, when I made the proposal, would and could do absolutely nothing for us now; that, not because of our procedure, but because of the procedure of our adversaries; the time for taking advantage of such a proposal has irrecoverably gone by. The proposal of which so much has been made, was

brought forward when the Presbytery of Strathbogie were engaged carrying on the trials of Mr. Edwards, and before the deed of his ordination was consummated. It formed part only of a complex proposition, in which there were other points far more strenuously insisted on than that—my object in proposing the repeal of the Veto Law being to allow the ministers of Strathbogie an opportunity of retrieving their position. And if ever I delivered an appeal more earnest than another, it was at that time, when I entreated the recusant ministers of Strathbogie to retrace their steps, and to return to that allegiance which they owed and had sworn to their ecclesiastical superiors,—as I considered it a *sine qua non* to any adjustment of the dispute that might be made, that the jurisdiction of the Church should be placed upon a right and secure footing,—that she should be reinstated in the untrammelled exercise of that authority which of necessity belongs to her over her own children. I remember well the shout of exultation with which my proposal for the repeal of the Veto was received by the hostile press of the day. I particularly remember that the *Times* newspaper, accrediting me certainly with more influence than I possessed, told its readers that now all would soon be right again,—that Dr. Chalmers had come forward and proposed the repeal of the Veto Law, and thereby homologated and submitted to the law as laid down by the Court of Session. (Laughter.) When I saw that such a use would be made of the repeal of the Veto, I immediately withdrew my proposal, seeing that it would tend not to the benefit, but to the discredit and disgrace of the Church, and to the encouragement of that most subtle and impracticable of all delusions, which is unable to distinguish or clearly to recognise the perfect competency of the Church to frame her own law and act on it,—for the only reason why I was anxious it should be repealed, and the non-intrusion principle secured, in some other way, was the good of the National Establishment. We cannot drive that idea into men's heads. I see that Lord Jeffrey, the other day, stated that he had come to consider the Veto Law illegal. (A Voice—"No; Lord Jeffrey has disclaimed saying so.") Well, whether he has disclaimed it or no, others have not. I will for a moment allow them to be right. I will suppose them to be right in saying that the Veto Law was an encroachment on the civil rights of the patrons. But they are not right in this, that the whole consequences of the decision finding it to be an encroachment, as coming from a Civil Court, involve only the dis severing of the temporal encroachments from the spiritual cure. And when I saw it triumphantly stated in the speeches delivered at Moderate meetings, and in the articles of Moderate newspapers that I had said the Veto Law was illegal and ought therefore to be repealed, I immediately saw that the Veto Law should be kept up, and the battle of our jurisdiction fought upon it. I would never have proposed, I would never have consented, to the repeal of the Veto Law, but for the purpose of allowing the Church's recusant sons to retrace the steps which they thought they had so unhappily taken. Now, however, we are placed in very different circumstances,—it would need tenfold greater retracing before we could come within even the sight of any such measure as I then ventured to suggest,—a retracing on the part of the Court of Session and House of Lords, which, however, are beyond our reach, and cannot be got at without the intervention of Parliament,—for tenfold more aggressions have been made by them since, than were ever heard of then. *When Parliament nullifies their doings, and gives to the Church that liberty which so long was preserved to her unquestioned and unassailed, then, but not till then, will it be time to speak of the repeal of the Veto.* In the altogether altered circumstances of the case, to ask the Church to repeal the Veto is to ask her to homologate her own disgrace,—her doing so would be the act of the crouching slave to the tyrant who had

brought him into bondage. (Cries of Hear, hear, and great applause.) There is only one thing more to which I wish to advert before sitting down. I rejoice that no one appears to be standing on trifles,—that our friends are not saying, would not this clause do, and that clause do, for all the purposes of a non-intrusion measure. Allow me to say, that I have the greatest possible dislike to pettifogging negotiations—(hear, hear)—and when great principles are involved, they ought to be utterly put to scorn. I always do lament any thing like an indication of an inclination to have the affair huddled up; for the Church may rest assured, that although by such a plan she might be left the semblance of freedom, she would still be left open to the unrestrained incursion of a power against which the strongest munitions of ecclesiastical law would be of no avail to her. *Recollect that it is not in one point only, but in all, that we are assailed.* The ancient wall of circumvallation that protected us in former days has all been broken down, and it is not by erecting one buttress here and another there that you will build it up again, and make it even as secure as formerly. For my part, I can see no effectual remedy but in having Lord Kames's principle generalised. That would enable us to get the better of all pretended difficulties as to deciding what is civil and what is ecclesiastical. The very interdicts of the Courts of Session would greatly help us in deciding that point. Why, there are the school-house, the church, the church-yard, the manse, the glebe, and the stipend,—these things are civil, and so the interdicts have declared. If there are more “civil” things than these, I would thank any man who knows them to point them out. (Laughter.) And thus, I think without drawing anything like a metaphysical line of demarcation between the one class of objects and the other, something tantamount to such a line is obtained in the very list of the things composing the one class drawn from the interdicts themselves. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) After this list then is completed, let it be provided that when any of these things are in any way bound up with the business of the Church, then the Court of Session may interfere, its power only extending, however, to the disposal of these things. Such a general enactment would secure the general liberties of the Church acting within her own sphere, while it would not supersede the necessity or desirableness of such bills as those of the Duke of Argyll or Campbell of Monzie. The use of them is, that they tend to limit and abridge the ground or occasion on which any question might occur leading to the separation of the benefice from the cure, which would be a serious evil, were the Church indefinitely and frequently exposed to the risk of it. If men would only for a moment throw aside the heat and personal feeling of the controversy, they could see nothing objectionable here. Where there is a will there is a way. I see no end to be served by the repeal of the Veto Law, which would be of any advantage to the Church herself; and I fear that the loud demand which we now hear for its repeal, proceeds from a wish, and nothing more, to propitiate those great men, the Lords,—whether judicial Lords, or aristocratic Lords, or landlords,—a wish to soothe their petted, wounded, disappointed feelings. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) I look at this sin as one of the melancholy symptoms of the downfall which I fear is awaiting this land. It does not bode well for any country when its leading men, the men of its power, are found so unwilling, as in our land they now appear to be, so unwilling to cast their personal feelings overboard, and meet together with a feeling of common patriotism, for the common object of preserving to the land the noblest of its institutions. Unless, indeed, their design be, as I apprehend it is, to root up the Presbyterian Establishment altogether—(loud cries of Hear, hear, and applause)—and certainly the most effectual method of doing so is just that which they have taken, to reduce our Scottish Church to the condition of a poor miserable degraded thing, odious and

despicable in the sight of all men. (Loud applause.) To repeal the Veto Law, would just be to afford one of the greatest triumphs imaginable to this infamous policy. Therefore I say, if there be enough of patriotism left in the land, give me not a party bill, but some such general legislative enactment as I have mentioned, and I am certain the honour of the patrons, the peace of the country, and the honesty of the Church, would be abundantly secured. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) One word more before sitting down. I hope that the practical policy of the Christian people of Scotland will be as vigorous and as strenuous now as if the certainty were staring them in the face that the Scottish Establishment is to come down. I hope that the meeting of elders to-morrow will be as strenuous, energetic, and determined in taking measures to provide the means of sustentation for the original Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as if the final sentence had gone forth against us. (Cries of hear, hear.) It is a most cruel and mischievous policy to defer the work of preparation at so well-nigh hopeless a time as the present; and it is absurd to say that our preparing for the worst will at all precipitate or hasten on the crisis. It must, I should think, have a directly contrary effect. If any thing will avert the crisis, it will assuredly be the spectacle of an united Christian nation resolving, that when their ministers are driven for consciences' sake out of the Establishment, they shall be maintained and continued in their usefulness,—and their evangelical services still preserved to the land,—determined never to let down their efforts, till they have made Scotland an experimental garden covered with churches and with schools. (Loud and continued applause.) I have no hope myself of a favourable issue to our struggle. Men won't see what we want, and, therefore, can't give us what we seek. I don't know a greater fatigue,—it must, be worse than a smith wielding a fore-hammer all day,—than that of operating upon impracticable understandings. (Laughter.) I have occupied a number of ostensible situations in connection with the Church; and after all the correspondence I have had with this Lord, and that member of Parliament, and it is not little, I have given up in despair all hope of making them understand how it is the best possible thing in the circumstances, and the most politic for the interests of the country, to have a clergy paid by the State, and yet acceptable to all the people of the land. (The Rev. Doctor resumed his seat amid loud applause.)

### 3.—FROM A SERMON ON THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT, AND FREE ENQUIRY.

*(Preached by the Rev. Dr. Candlish, 18th December, 1842.)*

Let the state of the churches also, as well as of the nations, be considered; and particularly the state of the churches among ourselves. How dark and ominous are the gathering clouds! Take the two establishments on the one hand, and the various other bodies of Christians, on the other, and observe how critical is their position. In England, a Popish leaven of unprecedented subtlety and power, pervading rapidly a vast body of the clergy, and influencing the whole of society, from its highest to its lowest circles,—skilful, almost beyond Jesuitism itself, to take advantage of all opportunities, and to wield the entire power of literature and of the press,—is fast gaining the ascendancy, both in the counsels of rulers and in the public mind, swallowing up or sweeping away all other questions,—and

barely enduring, for a time, a feeble evangelical protest. In Scotland, State power being ranged against the free conscience of the largest section of the ministers of the Establishment, is about to cause an extensive and probably an irreparable breach; nor is it easy to anticipate, in that event, any other than but a very faint resistance, and only for a time, on the part of the body which remains, to the sweeping tide already setting in from the south, in which, very soon, all our institutions may be involved. And in regard to the other denominations of Christians among us, it may be noticed, without offence, that they can scarcely be said to have kept themselves free from secular and political influences, of a kind unfavourable to their spiritual prosperity, any more than the establishments which they have been accustomed to condemn. In truth, it must be confessed, as a sin common to both, that they have been but too apt to mix themselves up, or to suffer themselves to be mixed up, with the secular politics of states and statesmen, while these continued still estranged from Christ and from his kingdom. In this respect, the Church of Christ has been much to be pitied, and much, also, to be blamed. Broken down into many different branches, too often at variance with one another,—she has been tempted to alliances with different principles and parties, in the struggles of worldly ambition; and she has been, by turns, the tool and the victim of them all. Her children, divided among themselves, have looked to opposite sections of the world for aid, and have lent their name, and the name of Him whom they serve, to dignity and hallow profane and ignoble strifes. Mere external and adventitious circumstances have very generally determined the character of these connections; and whether any particular branch of the Church should make common cause with one political party or another, has depended very much upon the relation in which it happened to stand to the powers and principalities of this world. Thus, if our brethren who are not connected with the Establishments, in England and Scotland, have been disposed to enter perhaps too keenly into the movements of a secular nature, which have agitated the popular mind, in our days,—and if they are now experiencing, in consequence of this, a partial, and we trust but temporary, diminution of the proper evangelical and spiritual influence which they might legitimately exert over the spirit of the times,—the same remark, in another direction, applies with at least equal force to those who have been contending on the other side. Undoubtedly, both the friends and the foes of religious Establishments have been too apt to lean on an arm of flesh, and to identify the support of their respective opinions with opposite political factions, not one of which has really had in it any religious element at all.

The progress of events, together with the revival, everywhere, of spiritual earnestness, and the subsiding of mere political heats, is fast breaking up all such confederacies. The movement in England, towards the restoration of ancient superstition,—the contest in Scotland, which is rending her national Church asunder,—and merging of many agitating questions of secular, strife, in the growing sense of a common danger, threatening the great principles of the Reformation,—these concurring causes are tending daily, more and more, to simplify the order and concentrate the forces, of the final contest, as it is even now begun. A shifting and shuffling of existing sects and parties may therefore be now looked for; a breaking up of present connections; separations among old associates; divisions in old institutions; and new combinations formed,—or, at least, new relations among the members of the old. Men will draw off to their respective sides, as the field is clearing for the combat; and they will shake themselves, more and more, free from all engagements and entanglements which might distract or disconcert them. The merely secular elements which have hitherto entered into the discussions or controversies, whether of the Church or of the world, will give place

to what is spiritual, whether it be spiritual wickedness in high places, or spiritual faith and patience in those who wrestle against it.

Everywhere, there are indications of this turn of events among us ; this tendency of religious interests to become again the leading questions of the day, and the hinge of great national movements ; and he must be blind indeed, who does not perceive the probability, of part, at least, of the drama of the seventeenth century being re-enacted in our own times, though, as the end draws near, with recelerated speed. But a few short years ago, who could have anticipated so marvellous a resuscitation of the spirit of Laud, and the fond image of Popery, of which he was the patron and the martyr ? And as this tide sets in with a wider sweep and swell, who can doubt that all the best energies which nerved the Puritans, will rally to the fortress of the Protestant cause,—the strong tower of the truth as it is in Jesus, which no billows of superstition or of scepticism can shake ? Already it is beginning to be apparent, that there are but two levers of real power, to move the world,—the one planted on Church authority, the other on the preaching of the Word. The earnest religious strife of former days is resumed ; and, after a comparative lull of two hundred years, during which, the weariness and exhaustion of the combatants, in the first instance, and afterwards the cold indifference of a dissipated age, had sophited many agitating questions,—these very questions are rising again,—and it appears that, instead of being settled and set at rest, as short-sighted worldly politicians imagined, by arrangements of compromise and expediency,—they are to be canvassed anew as keenly as before, and to convulse society, it may be, as severely. Nor is there any help for it. It would seem that the march of events is beyond the reach of human contrivances and plays of adjustment ; that men are no more masters of themselves ; that principles, whether right or wrong, of commanding power have obtained the mastery over them ; and that the struggle is transferred from the arena of mere secular politics, to a field where it can be less easily controlled or managed by human skill,—even the high field of a spiritual awakening.

And what, in these circumstances, are the prospects and duties of the true Church of the living God,—the really apostolic society, which, amid all its outward divisions, is one in the acknowledgment of sovereign grace, and of that great truth of God—the free justification of the sinner, by faith alone ? Surely, amid the thickening gloom, this ray of hope may cheer us, that the exigencies of the times will bring all who are thus likeminded closer together, and compel them better to understand one another. The perils of a common warfare, the pressure of a common persecution, the calls of a common duty to preach the Word,—to preach it freely, widely, everywhere, and at all seasons,—as the only antidote to antichristian poison, the only salt that can save the earth,—and, above all, the longings of a common hope, even the hope of the coming of the Lord, for which the souls under the altar cry, “ How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge thy saints ? ”—these common ties will surely draw nearer to one another all who hold the Head, which is Christ, and whom Antichrist would fain destroy ! The true Protestant Churches, separated, perhaps against their will, from connections to which they cleave, driven into the wilderness, and stript of secular influence, may yet be strong in the Lord alone, having his own assurance, “ Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”



4.—DR. CHALMERS' SPEECH AT THE BICENTENARY OF THE  
"WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY."—JULY, 1843.

Dr. Chalmers then addressed the Meeting as follows :—I can recognize no difference of sentiment, no difference of style, in the addresses which we have now heard from the representatives of various Christian denominations. There may be a complexional, but most assuredly no substantial difference between them,—a difference, it may be, in the style, or mode of putting, but no more affecting the essence or subject matter of what has now been delivered, than the difference between one and another in the tone of their voices. The same pervading gospel truth has been sounded forth, and that most manifestly and unequivocally, by one and all of them. And the question which, in the name of charity and of our common faith, I have to put in the hearing of this Assembly, is, whether such a unity of spirit, along with such a unity of substantial doctrine, should not suffice for a bond of peace.—(Cheers)

For myself, I can see no obstacle in the way of our being fellow-workers, and that to a great extent, for the objects of our common Christianity. And I rejoice to observe the growing prevalence and popularity of this sentiment,—a sentiment which, I can perceive, has formed itself into a sort of watchword, brief and memorable, and having in a certain cadence or alliteration, which recommends it all the more to the ear of the public, and is fitted to give it a larger currency and reception throughout the Churches of our land;—I advert to the well known and oft repeated aphorism of "co-operation without incorporation." I am aware that by many this goodly and well sounding aphorism has been fathered upon myself.—(Loud cheers)—and yet it is not just the motto that I would inscribe upon an escutcheon wherewith to signalize my family. I have no quarrel with the co-operation; and whenever aught which is good is expedited thereby the more of it the better. But I except to the negative, as being by far too absolute, that is laid by this maxim on the incorporation. The truth is, that whenever incorporation can be effected with advantage, and without violence to the consciences of the parties, it is in itself a most desirable object; and therefore, without saying, roundly and universally, "co-operation without incorporation," I would, though at the hazard of marring somewhat the euphony of the saying, and of laying an arrest on its way towards the rank and celebrity of a proverb,—I would substitute for these words, "co-operation now, and this with the view, as soon as may be, to incorporation afterwards" (Loud and continued cheering.)

As I am in earnest for the adoption of something practical, and that the fruit of this great meeting shall come forth in deeds as well as professions, let me be indulged with one or two instances, which may at the same time serve as illustrations of my meaning. The Presbyterians of the General Assembly of Ulster are scarcely if at all distinguishable from the Presbyterians of the Free Church of Scotland. Instead of a similarity, it might be almost, or very nearly, called an identity which subsists between us; and in all those cases where we can work together, there seems not a single obstacle in the way of our most cordial and entire co-operation. And yet the very distance of the two countries from each other presents, in my opinion, a barrier in the way of our incorporation,—if by this be meant, that we shall so merge into each other, as to have one and the same General Assembly as a common court of ultimate appeal, and presiding in the form of a

central authority over all the inferior jurisdictions of both. Because there is the *idem genere* between them there ought on that account to be a perfect co-operation; but it follows not that there should be the *idem numero*,—the impediment to the latter being not a difference of principle, but a mere difference of position, and therefore not infringing in the very least on that unity which consists not only in oneness of doctrine, but in oneness even of worship, and government. and forms.

But for our second example, there are some Episcopalians in Scotland who are also evangelical, and so are all the independents in Scotland—(Cheers) at least as far as I know of them. Between them and us, therefore, there is not the difference of a straw in point of theology; and this surely forms a good and solid basis for co-operation,—though for some time I fear we shall not,—and just because of the difference in our respective governments,—find our way to the incorporation. But I would have you remark here, that this is owing to a distinct cause from that which obtained in the former instance. It is not because of any difference in our local position, as with the Presbyterians of Ireland, for here we are intermingled the one with the other in the same country. There is no difference of local position then; but there is, unfortunately I do think, what may be called a difference of principle,—that is, in as far as those of the one denomination feel very strong on the side of their Episcopacy, and those of the other feel very strong on the side of their Independency. I regret that either should lay so great stress on the mere point of government, when, on the point of doctrine, the great *capita fidei*,—the terms of salvation,—there should be such a cordial and entire agreement; insomuch, that with fullest sympathy we could associate together under the same roof as fellow worshippers at the same family altar, and recognise each other as fellow-travellers to the same eternal home. Doubtless, they are just as much entitled to express the same regret at the stress that we lay on our Presbyterianism (laughter and cheers.)—and most assuredly this is not the place or the occasion for attempting a settlement of the question, by entering on the merits of these several Church governments. Both parties I am afraid, that is, our Episcopalian friends on the one hand, and our Congregational friends on the other, would think that we were arrogating too much if we claimed any advantage over them in respect of principle. But I do hope that neither of them will be offended, if we do felicitate ourselves on the advantage we have over them in respect of position. I do not mean now in respect of local or geographical position, for here we are all living side by side in the same neighbourhood. I mean something different from this,—the midway position of our tenets or views on the subject in question, and in virtue of which, I think, we stand at a far better rallying point for at length a great and extensive re union among these three denominations,—far better, I do think, than if we stood at either of the extremes. (Cheers.) The Congregationalists amongst us can tell whether they are very sanguine of ever bringing down even the best and holiest men of Episcopacy, to the level of their own platform; and the Episcopalians can, in like manner, tell whether they ever cherish the fond imagination that, in opposition to a bias strong as that of gravitation itself, they will be able to draw up Congregationalism to their towering heights of Episcopacy. (Great laughter.) We, on the other hand, are sanguine enough to believe it not impossible that we should both bring down the one and draw up the other, to the intermediate place which ourselves occupy. (Great cheering.) And we can descry something like a stepping-stone, constructed by each of these parties, and which though not designed by either for an approximation to us, may, we hope, eventually lead to it. We can see, on the one hand, amongst the Episcopalians, a demand for their ancient Convocation, and for assessors to their bishops,

and for a subordinate government in the rural deaneries. On the other hand, there is nothing more frequent among independents now than Congregational Unions and associated bodies. Let us hope that this might ultimately carry them forward, both from the right and the left, to a coalescence with ourselves; and, meanwhile, let us rejoice in the oneness of our theology, which, like the rod of Aaron, I trust, will at length swallow up all our differences; and meanwhile, whereunto we have attained, let us walk by the same rule,—let us mind the same thing.—(Great cheering.)

This prepares the way for our next instance, where the various denominations come nearest of all to each other, and who, though somewhat split and receded into different parties, but yet, as the common descendants of one and the same ancestry trace up their pedigree to the divines, or at least to the deeds of that great Assembly, whose sittings, now of two hundred years back, we have met to commemorate. Between the Free Church of Scotland and the Presbyterian Dissenters of this country there is no difference of government, and no difference of theology which I am aware of; or, in other words, no insuperable bar, I will not say in the way of an immediate, but in the way of an eventual, and, I do hope, of a speedy incorporation. At all events, the maxim of co-operation without incorporation would admit, in their case, of being greatly modified. Without, it may be for a time; but when both identity of principle and identity of opposition are on its side, I should be loth to say without, hopelessly and for ever. There are certain facilities which can only be indicated very generally in a speech, but which can be understood executively, and in detail, by repeated conversations, and which, if adopted, would serve, in my opinion, to hasten forward this great commemoration. Let me notice one of these as a specimen, to which I will confine myself, for I feel that I am making too great an encroachment on the time of this Assembly. However, it delights me to observe from the programme of this day, that the very topic on which I meant to enter a certain way, but which I shall only start now, forms part and parcel of the prescribed subject for the conversation which is immediately to follow. For surely when your assigned theme is co-operation in missionary enterprises, you do not mean to exclude home missions; and what I should have insisted on is just co-operation in these, as the likeliest step to a coming incorporation. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) We cannot enter far on this as our common work, without the practical necessity of a common understanding, and that for the object of a joint or common regulation. We could not, for example, take up Edinburgh as the field of such an undertaking, without some such method of distribution in the allocation of the respective districts to the respective labourers, as might save all confusion or interference in the prosecution of this great work. Let us hope that the vast worth of the territorial principle might, while engaged in the furtherance of this design, become more obvious to the understandings, and that by the recommendation of itself to the experience both of Christian men and Christian ministers. It is a principle which has been mainly lost sight of in our large towns, even by the Established clergy, yet a principle, I trust, on which the Free Church of Scotland will never relinquish its hold, although it is quite plain, when we look to the plenteousness of the harvest and the fewness of the labourers, it is not a principle which our Free Church can work out, or carry forward to its ultimate effect and accomplishment, alone. Let us hope that the necessary co-operation might bring together men who have been long standing at a distance, and frowning on each other from their respective orbits,—might chase away our thousand misunderstandings, and prove a stepping-stone by which co-operation now might lead to incorporation afterwards.—(Great applause.)

Before I am done, I feel desirous of bringing above boards what I think

will operate as a bar in the way of a cordial and good understanding, so long as it remains the object of a sensitive and fearful *reticence*. I do not sympathize with the exceeding care and caution of those people who look so prudent and so wary, and tell us that nothing must be said about Voluntaryism. (Loud laughter, and cries of Hear, hear.) I confess, on the other hand, my anxiety to say something about it, and that because of the conviction under which I labour, that while suffered to abide within the cell of one's own thoughts, where, from the very irksomeness of its confinement, it might rankle in the form of an unexplained grudge, it will operate most injuriously as a preventive to that full union between soul and soul, so indispensable to the comfort and the efficacy of co-operation between those who have now met together, and that with the avowed purpose of seeing eye to eye. (Loud cries of Hear, hear.) Why, on the contrary, I would have it proclaimed openly and without reserve, that there is a difference of opinion upon this question; and this, not with the design of creating a breach or casting up a barrier between the parties, but with the very opposite design, of pointing out the egregious folly, if I may so term it, of suffering any such difference to stand in the way of their mutual helpfulness and encouragement, in every practicable walk of well-doing, for the good of our common Christianity. I am desirous of tabling the subject in the sight and hearing of all, that it may both be recognised as the topic of a real and honest difference, and, at the same time, be utterly disarmed and scotched as a topic of mischievous dissension. (Great cheering.) For how does the matter stand? Here are two parties, each honestly bent on the adoption of such measures as might best conduce to the moral and religious well-being of their fellow men; but the one happening to think that the State should lend itself to the same object, by the method of an endowment, and the other happening to think the opposite of this. I ask, in the name of common sense, if two parties are to suspend their duty, common to both, and if that duty be co-operation for a great and general good, on which the hearts of each are alike set, are they to suspend this, because they choose to differ in opinion respecting the duty of a third party that has no connection with either of them! (Loud cries of Hear, hear, hear.) We assuredly stand as hopelessly dis severed from the party in question, and have as little hope of being restored to a connection with them, as if there had sprung up betwixt us an immovable wall of brass, a thousand cubits high. (Loud laughter.) We, on the one hand, can enter into no terms with a Government, who, because they endow a Church, think they have a claim to govern it; and they on the other hand, keep as resolute a hold of this Erastian imagination, as if they would never let it go till the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. So that the question now resolves itself into this. Will there, or will there not, be religious establishments in the days of the millenium! (Laughter.) To me, at least, it seems the clear path both of wisdom and duty just to leave that question for the millenium itself to settle, when the millenium comes; and, meanwhile, do all we can to speed onward these millennial days, when the din of controversy shall be no longer heard, and the charity of the gospel shall have shed its dewy influences over the whole earth, now turned into a happy, and a harmonised, and, withal, universal Christendom. (Enthusiastic applause.)

I confess, at the same time, a keener scientific interest in this question than ever, now that Voluntaryism, brought to the test of experience, is fully put upon its trial. I for one will make it my strenuous endeavour to do it all justice, by drawing on its resources and capabilities to the uttermost. (Laughter and applause.) The most direct way surely of giving it a fair trial is just to try how much it will yield, after that a full and fair appliance has been brought to bear upon it. It is but justice to add, that we are

now in the very thick of the experiment. Some years ago we tried what Government would do in the way of an endowment for the religious instruction of the people, and, after many a weary and fruitless negotiation; got nothing for our pains. We have now made our appeal to the Christian public, and in as few months as we spent of years with the Government, we have obtained at the hands of the people the promise of towards three hundred thousand pounds. (Loud and continued cheering.) We are not going to be at all scholastic on the subject, or to speak of the distinction between Voluntaryism *ab extra*, and Voluntaryism *ab intra*—(laughter)—however confident we are that, on the strength of this distinction, we could make out a full vindication of our whole argument. We call upon Voluntaryism to open all its fountain-heads, even though it should land us in the predicament of the well-digger, who succeeded so amply in his attempts to obtain water, that he made a narrow escape from drowning in the abundance of those rushing streams which he himself had evoked from their hiding places. (Loud laughter.) Now, though my own theory should incur by it the semblance, nay, even if so be, the reality of a defeat and refutation, I for one should most heartily rejoice, if Voluntaryism, playing upon us in every direction, shall make such demonstrations of its exuberance and its power as well nigh to submerge myself, and utterly to overwhelm my argument. (Great cheering.)

However it may turn out, the result will be a most instructive one. Should it so happen that, after Voluntaryism has made its utmost efforts, it shall fall short of a full provision for the Christian instruction of the people, so as to leave thousands and thousands more unreached and unreclaimed, and should an enlightened Government, for the sake of these, hold forth an endowment, which shall leave us as unfettered as their *Regium Donum*, leaves the Presbyterians of Ireland, I am not prepared to say that it would be wrong, either in the one party to make such an offer, or in the other party to accept of it. But, as I have already stated there is no hope whatever of any such overture being made, or of there ever being any practical call for the entertainment of such a question. Meanwhile, let us endeavour so to speed on the achievements of Voluntaryism, as to anticipate and supercede the necessity of this question; and they who intent on great designs, keep by great principles, will at length make full acquittal of theirs as being the only true consistency,—let hostile or unintelligent observers make what use they may of their party distinctions and party names. Dr. Chalmers concluded amid loud and protracted cheering, which lasted for some time. The whole address was listened to by a crowded assemblage, with the most intense interest, and responded to with the utmost enthusiasm.)

## 5.—MISCELLANEOUS.

**ON THE CHURCH'S POWER TO INTERPRET SCRIPTURE.**—Man, before the Bible is like a blind man before the sun. The sun is light itself; nevertheless the blind man cannot see it. The Bible also is full of clearness; "but the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them," 1 Cor. ii. 14. He may, indeed, have an historial knowledge of them; but of that spiritual and salutary intelligence which giveth life to the soul he is utterly destitute.

And how shall he obtain it? In order that the blind man may see, it will be of no avail to alter the sun; the closed eyes must be opened. The eyes

of our mind must also be opened, madam, in order that the Bible, which we find obscure, may become clear to us. It is from our hearts, and not from the Bible, that the veil must be removed. Thus teaches the apostle Paul, when, speaking of the Jews, he says, "Even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart; nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away," 2 Cor. iii 15, 16. It was not sufficient for Christ's disciples, that their Master should explain to them the Scriptures; it was also necessary that he should "open their understandings, that they might understand them," Luke xxiv. 45. Neither was it sufficient for Lydia to hear the preaching of St. Paul; it was necessary that her heart should be opened, to attend unto the things which he said, Acts xvi. 14. Here, then, is the difficulty, madam; and the guide that we require in reading the Scriptures, is one who can not only explain them to us, but who, above all, can open our hearts to receive them.

Where shall we find this guide? In the visible tribunal to which they would fain subject you? Admitting that this tribunal is what the Abbé believes it to be; and that it can explain the Scriptures without danger of error; it is a valuable help, certainly; yet it is not that of which you have the most urgent need. It only removes the least of your difficulties; the chief obstacle still subsists in all its force. It is as though a surgeon, called to undertake the cure of a blind man, were to fix all his attention on some apparatus for increasing the intensity of the sun's rays; and were to do nothing for the restoration of his sight. In vain the Bible is explained, commented upon, interpreted; so long as the heart remains closed, the Bible will remain so too. Now, does the Abbé's visible tribunal pretend to engage to open your heart? The bishop of Rome, the fathers of a council, even of a general council—what do I say? even the angels of heaven—do they engage to give, or to take from you, a single feeling, a single thought? *No, madam, and you might perish for lack of knowledge at the feet of an "infallible tribunal," which, all infallible as it is, is not the master of your heart.*

In grace as in nature, God's most precious gifts are the most common.—*Anon.*

**THE CHURCH.**—The believer exists before the Church, as the trees are before the forest; and Adam for instance, if he believed the promise of grace, was saved by faith before there was a Church in the world. The word of God makes believers; and believers make the Church.—*Monod.*

**GOD'S FORGIVENESS OF SIN.**—Mark how Moses pleads with God—"Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, as thou hast forgiven them from Egypt until now." (Num. xiv. 19.) He doth not say, as men do—Lord, this is the first fault, thou hast not been troubled before to sign a pardon: but, Lord, because thou hast pardoned them so often already, I beseech thee pardon them once again.—*Flarel.*

The Psalmist pleads the greatness of his sins, as argument for mercy. He does not say, pardon mine iniquity, for I have done much good to counterbalance it; or, pardon mine iniquity for it is small, and thou hast no great reason to be angry with me; my offence is not such but that thou mayest well enough overlook it. But he says the very contrary of this—"Pardon mine iniquity, *for it is great.*" (Psalms. xxv. 11.) Hence then, let the greatest of sinners learn that.—If we truly come to God for mercy, the greatness of our sins will be no impediment.—*Edwards.*

**THE WORD OF LIFE.**—Let me entreat you to make this place "the valley of decision;" this day, if you are not yet born again, the birth-day of your

soul. Whosoever lips teach you, I say again, you will learn nothing rightly if you do not learn from Christ. That willing, patient, most benign Saviour, let him gain the love he has long sought of you, and reign for your everlasting well-being in your soul. Had another event occurred, as might have been, and you had seen here an empty pulpit marked by a silent Sabbath, and one had said to you, "Your minister is dead,"—would you not have given heed to the words, and uttered kindly a lamenting expression, "Ah my brother!"—have called to mind where you had last seen him, and what were the words he had last spoken to you? But what words, my friends, could he have said so kind, so faithful, so important, as those I now leave with you, viz, Flee to Christ, escape from hell, lay hold of eternal life? "Now is the accepted time:" yield yourselves up with all your sins, whatever they are. He is equal to your salvation, whatever it may cost. You need not be afraid of overtaking his love, whatever the burden you lay upon it. Delay not doing now what you will never repent having done: what, if you do it not, you will for ever repent to have left undone. Make sure of happiness that is yours the moment you believe, and that lasts with you as long as eternity. Hear my words, ye whose hearts admonish you. Let this be the last hour of resistance and rebellion, the first of submission, reconciliation, and peace. I leave these things with you, beloved friends. May God make them available for instruction, reproof, and encouragement, according to the wants of your souls, tenderly longed for by your most pitying Saviour,—whose servant now, perhaps in the providence of God, conveys the last message he is commissioned to address to you.—*From an Address by the Rev. Henry Grey to the Congregation of St. Mary's, Edinburgh, in the prospect of his quitting that Church on Sabbath 15th May.*

## VI.—LOCAL INTELLIGENCE.

Dr. Duff's short series of Public Lectures on the Church of Scotland, has now come to a close. The third was delivered in the Town Hall of Calcutta, on the 17th, and the fourth and last Lecture, on the 24th instant, both of them to large and deeply-interested audiences. Our confined space, and the circumstances also that our own pages are honored as the first vehicle of publishing these eloquent and impressive addresses—restrain us in commenting on them as we gladly would, and in pointing out their many and varied excellencies. But no commendations of ours are needed, to draw the attention of the Christian Public, to any work of Dr. Duff's. We were glad to understand it announced at the last lecture, that the Series would shortly appear in a separate form, and we presume with Notes and Appendices. Meanwhile our readers at a distance have nearly the same advantage, by perusal, in succession, in our pages, as the local public have enjoyed in attending their oral delivery. May God's blessing follow this able effort to advance the cause of His Truth!

We think the following Letter which appeared in the *Bengal Hurkaru* of the 20th instant, deserving of pointed attention :—

### THE PROGRESS OF TRACTARIANISM.

*To the Editor of the Bengal Hurkaru.*

DEAR SIR.—If you wish to hear a downright Tractarian discourse, come up to Barrackpore.

On Sunday morning last, the Rev. Mr. Gladwin, Station Chaplain, preached from 2 Timothy i. 13, “Hold fast the form of sound words” the form of sound words being the Prayer Book.

In the course of his Sermon, the Revd. Gentleman laid down the following points or doctrines.

1. That without the Creeds, it is impossible to know what one ought to believe, and what not.

2. That to attempt to learn what to believe by reading the Bible, without the Prayer Book as a guide, will only lead to foolish fancies.

3. Baptismal regeneration, the terms used being that every child in its baptism is made partaker of the new birth.

4. That those who worship together in the temple on earth (explained by the quotation “not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together”) may rest assured that they shall worship together in the heavenly temple.

How long are these things to be? Is not the time at hand, if not at the very doors, for the Evangelical Members of the Church of England to come out of her, and be separate?

Yours faithfully,

A. B.

We also, happen to know on the most unquestionable authority—that the Popish doctrines here attributed to the Rev. Mr. Gladwin, were distinctly and emphatically preached publicly by him on the Sunday referred to, at Barrackpore. The Reverend gentleman himself would unquestionably have corrected the statement ere this, if inaccurate. With A. B. we just ask this question, “How long are these things to be?” And how long is *our common* PROTESTANTISM to be shocked and scandalized by such open inculcation as this, in *her name*, of doctrines which she utterly repudiates and abhors? It is just come to this,—Is the Church of England a Protestant Church, or not?

We owe an expression of acknowledgment to the *Bengal Hurkaru*, the *Friend of India*, and several other Journals, which have been pleased to notice our little Magazine in terms of much kindness and encouragement—terms which we gladly refer to their approbation of the Cause it is our humble endeavour to serve. Nor can we help expressing also our gratification at the almost unprecedented extent of circulation already obtained by our Journal, though not two months old. We can make no better use of the measure of popu-



larity with which we are thus already honored—than to direct anew the attention of all our readers, of whatever section of the Universal Church, to the earnest appeal which the Committee of the Free Church *Building-Fund* has again put forth, and which will be found in an accompanying Advertisement. As it is there said—"One generous, strenuous effort of Christian beneficence, is all that is needed":—Shall not this effort be made? Surely a cause which unites in its recommendation all that is dear to the piety and the patriotism of Scotland, will not be advocated in vain before Scotsmen in India! Let those who have much, spare something of that much, to this good cause: let those who have a little, give of that little with cheerfulness:—and of both it will be true,

"They'll get a blessing wi' the lave,  
An' never miss't."

We regret that our limits admit of our doing little more than notice a volume of very beautiful Sacred Poetry, which has been published at home, and of which an early copy has been kindly sent us—"The Highlands, Scottish Martyrs, and other Poems; by the Rev. James G. Small, Edinburgh." Commended as a literary work, in language of no ordinary praise, by Professor Wilson and other judges almost as eminent—our humble tribute of applause can scarcely be thought necessary. But we may at least testify to the excellent Christian tone and character of these elegant compositions. We observe the work is to be obtained at Messrs. Thacker's.

---

# THE FREE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. I.]      WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1843.      [No. 5.

## I.—LECTURES EXPOSITORY OF THE PRINCIPLES,—THE MAINTENANCE OF WHICH HAS LED TO THE RECENT DISRUPTION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, AND THE CONSEQUENT FORMATION OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

---

**LECTURE III.—THE SOLE AND SUPREME HEADSHIP OF THE LORD JESUS, CHRIST OVER THE CHURCH.**—*The Church a Spiritual Society for the attainment of spiritual ends—Analysis of the Revolution Settlement of 1690, by which the Doctrine of the Supreme Headship of Christ, and the rights and liberties of his people, flowing therefrom were gloriously vindicated—Nature and objects of the Act of Security which was declared to be a fundamental and essential condition of the Treaty of Union between Scotland and England, in 1707—The entire constitution, rights and liberties of the Church of Scotland, completely secured thereby, and declared to be unalterable for ever—Account of the perfidious designs of the Jacobite ministry of Queen Anne, who violated National faith and the most solemn National Treaties, by treacherously restoring Patronages in 1712—The true character of this obnoxious, illegal, and unconstitutional Act described—Universal and persevering resistance made to it by the Church and people of Scotland—Abundant evidence adduced to prove that even this base and hated Patronage Act left the independent spiritual jurisdiction of the Church wholly unimpaired—As long, therefore, as the Church was faithful to its own principles, it was in its power effectually to prevent unacceptable pastors from being violently intruded on reclaiming congregations—But, during the latter half of last century, the Church became faithless to its own unaltered constitution—The distinguishing characteristics of Moderatism—The dreary horrors of Moderate ascendancy—Warning to all Churches not to suffer the Doctrine of the Supreme Headship of Christ to fall into practical desuetude—Conclusion.*

From the preceding Lectures it must have appeared abundantly manifest, that, in the true Church of Christ, all is spiritual and peculiar. It is a spiritual and peculiar Society, constituted for spiritual and peculiar ends, and governed by spiritual and peculiar laws, specially and exclusively adapted to the attainment of such ends. These ends may be summarily defined to be, the redemption and salvation

of lost sinners. The *peculiar* principles and laws, therefore, of the Redemptive Economy, as exemplified and embodied in the Christian Church, do not and cannot extend either to fallen or unfallen angels—either to the spirits of the obstinately impenitent on earth, or of the finally reprobate in perdition. Hence, the pre-eminent singularity of the Church in the entire character of its constitution, government, discipline, and laws—its distinctiveness, separatedness, and independence of all power that is merely secular or civil—its inherent capability of pervading the whole globe, without interfering with the righteous sovereignty of any one of its potentates, or subverting any one of their lawful civil institutions—its wondrous adaptedness to the wants and necessities of the human spirit, without respect to age or complexion, rank or profession, country or climate—illuminating all and vivifying all—cheering them with the radiance of a better light and animating them with the breath of a better life—and gathering up the successive ameliorations of time, as trophies and appendages to those monuments of grace, that shall hereafter become monuments of glory, honour, and immortality. With a thing so pure, so spiritual, so etherial, so unearthly, what has the vulgar touch of merely secular wit, or the coarse arm of merely secular authority to do, except it be, to mar, to mutilate, and to destroy?

But, though the Church of Christ be essentially spiritual and the influence which it wields essentially spiritual too, it is nevertheless real and mighty. Hence, one reason why the secular power, jealous of any thing that might seem to be a rival, has so often madly striven to grasp what does not belong to it, any more than the almost omnific energy that wheels the planets in their orbits. Of this melancholy infatuation our last Lecture contained many fatal proofs. For 130 years, the history of the Church of Scotland presents little else than a succession of daring encroachments on the part of the State, and of resistance and suffering, followed by final triumph, on the part of the Church. The eventful narrative we brought down to the glorious revolution of 1688. And we now proceed first of all to point out the leading heads of the famous Revolution Settlement.

The State having from 1660 to 1688, outrageously invaded the prerogative of the Lord Jesus Christ, as sole Head and King over his own Church, by assuming all her powers, and superseding her proper jurisdiction altogether, the first step in the retrogressive and restorative process was, to repeal all the Acts by which King and Parliament had incompetently and usurpingly established a system of Ecclesiastical Polity, which the Church believed to be contrary to the word of God. This was promptly done in 1689; and the step was as promptly followed by a repeal of the Act which unblushingly assumed his Majesty's supremacy, as "*a right inherent in the crown.*" That impious Act was now declared to be "inconsistent with the Establishment of the Church Government now desired"—and "in the whole heads, articles, and clauses thereof, to be of no force or effect in all time coming." It was accordingly "abrogated, rescinded, and annulled." The State, having thus wholly with-

drawn itself from the province of the Church, and wholly relinquished the jurisdiction and authority which it had so unrighteously assumed therein, next proceeded to append the civil sanction and ratification to the Church's independent jurisdiction and intrinsic authority. It did so in the most effectual way, by "reviving, renewing, and confirming" in 1690, the famous Act, or "*magna charta*," of 1592, "in the whole heads thereof," with the exception of one clause relative to patronage, the omission of which was a decided improvement ;—all contrary Acts whatsoever being at the same time disannulled and abolished. It did so, by proclaiming in the preamble of its new charter, that it is a "duty" in rulers to recognise, "settle and secure the true Protestant religion, according to the truth of God's word as it hath of a long time been professed within this land ; as also the Government of Christ's Church within this nation, agreeable to the word of God, and most conducive to the advancement of true piety and godliness." It did so, by passing a separate Act for the formal abolition of Lay Patronage\* which had been reintroduced with other unreasonable and Anti-Christian burdens, at the Restoration ;—by vesting in the hands of the heritors of the parish, (being Protestants) and the Church elders, not the *right* of "*presenting*," but simply the *initiative privilege*, of "naming and proposing the person to the whole congregation, to be either approved or disapproved by them ;"—by declaring the Presbytery to be the body "at whose judgment and at whose determination the calling and entry of a particular minister is to be ordered and concluded"—thus completely shutting out all reference to, or right of review by, any Civil court, and "preserving this most important of all privileges and rights within a strictly ecclesiastical and spiritual range of control." And, finally, it did so, in the most emphatic manner which it is possible to conceive, by formally ratifying the Westminster Confession of faith, without qualification or reserve, "as the *public* and *avowed* Confession of this Church, containing the sum and substance of the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches." In this way, all the articles of that elaborate formulary, with all the Doctrines and principles thereof, have been engrossed in the Statute book, and actually incorporated with the constitutional Law of the Land. Now, amongst the Doctrines thus adopted, sanctioned, and ratified by statutory enactment on the part of the State, in reference to the ecclesiastical

\* "Yet it is, to be particularly considered," to quote the words of the Commissioners of Assembly, at a subsequent period, "that the same Parliament, 1690, was so tender of the civil rights of Patrons, and so sincerely desirous only to restore the Church to its just and primitive liberty of calling ministers in a way agreeable to the word of God, that they only discharged the Patron's power of presenting ministers to vacant parishes ; but, as to any thing of their civil rights, did make the condition of Patrons better, than before, not only by reserving unto them the right of disposal of vacant stipends for pious uses, within the parish, but also giving unto them the heritable rights of the tithes, restricting the minister, who formerly had the said right, to stipends much below the value of the said tithes."

constitution and independent polity and spiritual jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland, these two—being the very poles on which the whole spiritual edifice revolves—hold a conspicuous place ; *viz.*, first, That *there is NO OTHER HEAD OF THE CHURCH but THE LORD JESUS CHRIST* ; and second, “*That the Lord Jesus Christ, AS KING AND HEAD OF HIS CHURCH, hath therein appointed a Government in the hands of Church officers, DISTINCT FROM THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.*”

Thus triumphant and complete, was the vindication of the Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus over his own Church—with all the spiritual and ecclesiastical rights and privileges flowing therefrom. Peace, harmony and joy prevailed and abounded throughout the happy land. To this effect, the surviving testimonies are as numerous as they are conclusive. From these we select one, as coming from a quarter which all must acknowledge to be disinterested and impartial. In 1717, the celebrated De Foe published his “*Memoirs of the Church of Scotland.*” Referring to the period, subsequent to the Revolution Settlement, and immediately preceding the publication of his own work, he thus writes :—“*The people (of Scotland) are restrained in the ordinary practice of immoralities. As to theft, murder, and other capital crimes, they come under the cognizance of the civil magistrate, as in other countries ; but in those things which the Church has power to punish, the people being constantly and impartially prosecuted, they are thereby the more restrained, kept sober, and under government ; and you may pass through twenty towns in Scotland without seeing any broil, or hearing one oath sworn in the streets ; whereas, were a blind man to come from there into England, he shall know the first town, he sets his foot in, within the English border, by hearing the name of God blasphemed and profanely used even by the very little children in the street.*”

For many years, no divisions whatever took place in the happy and united Church of Scotland,—still less any secession from its ranks. But events were preparing, in the womb of which lay the seeds of future and even distant strife. In 1707, a proposal was made for the Parliamentary union of the two Kingdoms. At first the proposal was very unpopular in Scotland ; and a general fermentation and wide spread opposition were the result. But the chief difficulty regarded the Church which had been founded by noble Reformers, built up by holy confessors, and watered by the blood of martyrs. The bitterest experience had taught the Scottish people how impossible it was for the English nation to comprehend their principles of Church Polity ; and how reckless that nation could be of their most sacred feelings and dearest rights. “*If the Scottish Parliament,*” reasoned they, in substance, “*be united to the English, then, on a purely Scottish question, may the Scottish members, from their great numerical inferiority, be overwhelmingly outvoted by their southern compeers. What security, in that case, have we for the continued integrity of the Church of our fathers ? What guarantee have we that the United Legislature, by its preponderance of English members, may not tam-*

per with the constitution and subvert the liberties of a Church, which they hate or despise as repugnant to the genius of their own? Where, then, is our shield of defence against the renewal of former anarchy and the horrors of former persecution!"—It was the possible realization of such an issue that extorted from Lord Belhaven, in his famous speech against the Union, the following remark:—"I think I see a National Church founded upon a rock, secured by a Claim of Right, hedged and fenced about by the strictest and pointedest legal sanction that sovereignty could contrive, voluntarily descending into a plain, upon an equal level with Jews, Papists, Socinians, Arminians, Anabaptists and other sectaries."

How then, was this formidable preliminary obstacle to be overcome? By an expedient which reflects the highest credit, alike on the unbending firmness and the far-seeing sagacity of our Fathers. "We shall not enter into treaty," said they in substance, "we shall not even discuss the terms or conditions of a treaty, until ample security be given, that the constitution and liberties of our Church shall be fully and honourably maintained—that these shall never be touched, or meddled, or interfered with, by the United Legislature—and that the pledged faith of the nation to that effect be made a fundamental and essential condition of any Treaty or Union to be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms." Well, an Act of Security was passed, as the basis of the Treaty of Union, which provided, "that the Commissioners for that Treaty should not treat of, or concerning any alteration of the worship, discipline, and government of the Church in this kingdom (Scotland) *as now by law established*:—And it being reasonable and necessary that the true Protestant religion, *as presently professed within this kingdom*, with the *worship, discipline, and government* of this Church, should be *effectually and unalterably secured*, therefore, her Majesty, with advice and consent of the said Estates of Parliament, do thereby establish and confirm the said true Protestant religion, and the *worship, discipline, and government* of this Church, *to continue without any alteration to the people of this land in all succeeding generations*:—And more especially, her Majesty, with advice and consent aforesaid, *ratifies, approves, and FOR EVER confirms* the fifth Act of the first Parliament of King William and Queen Mary, entitled, "An Act ratifying the *Confession of Faith*, and settling *Presbyterian Church Government*, with ALL THE OTHER ACTS of Parliament relating thereto. And her Majesty, with advice and consent aforesaid, expressly provides and declares, that the foresaid true Protestant religion, contained in the abovementioned Confession of Faith, with the *form and purity of worship presently in use within the Church, and its Presbyterian Church Government and Discipline*; that is to say, *the Government of the Church, by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods and General Assembly*, all established by the foresaid Acts of Parliament, pursuant to the Claim of Right, SHALL REMAIN AND CONTINUE UNALTERABLE; and that the said *Presbyterian Government* shall be *the only Government of the Church within the Kingdom of Scotland*.

And lastly, that after the decease of her present Majesty (whom God long preserve !) the sovereign succeeding to her in the royal Government of the Kingdom of Great Britain, shall, *in all time coming*, at his or her accession to the crown, *swear and subscribe*, that they shall *inviolably maintain and preserve* the foresaid settlement of the true Protestant religion, with the *government, worship, discipline, rights, and privileges* of this Church, as above established by the laws of this Kingdom :—And it is hereby statute and ordained, that this Act of Parliament, with the establishment therein contained, shall be *held and observed in all time coming*, as A FUNDAMENTAL AND ESSENTIAL CONDITION of any Treaty or Union to be concluded betwixt the two kingdoms, WITHOUT ANY ALTERATION THEREOF, OR DEROGATION THERETO, IN ANY SORT FOR EVER ; as also, that this Act of Parliament and settlement therein contained, *shall be inserted and repeated in any Act of Parliament that shall pass for agreeing and concluding the foresaid Treaty or Union* between the two Kingdoms ; and that the same shall be therein *expressly declared to be a FUNDAMENTAL AND ESSENTIAL CONDITION of the said Treaty or Union in ALL TIME COMING.*”

Accordingly, in the Act ratifying and approving the Treaty of Union of the two Kingdoms of Scotland and England, the foresaid Act of Security was embodied, and declared to be its basis—its fundamental and essential condition for ever. And the Articles of Union, expressly founded on, and embodying the said Act of Security, were “enacted and ordained to be, and continue in all time coming, the sure and perpetual foundation of a complete and entire union of the two Kingdoms ;”—while it was “enacted and declared, that all laws and statutes in this Kingdom, so far as they are contrary to, or inconsistent with the terms of these articles, shall, from and after the Union, cease, and become void.”

Such was the studied, the elaborate, the systematic carefulness with which the pious and the faithful people of Scotland laboured and succeeded in maintaining entire the constitution, the independence, the rights, and the liberties of the Church of their martyred fathers—springing, as all their efforts did, from the determination to assert and uphold the supreme Headship of Jesus Christ their only Lord and King. Surely in these attempts, the force of language could go no farther. But in all human affairs, we are ever reminded of the admonition, “cease ye from man.” Hitherto, the Church had been more in the barren wilderness than in the promised land—had experienced longer periods of suffering than of triumph—of trial than of rest—of adversity than of prosperity—of chilling winter than of reviving spring. And now, when her largest wishes were realized—her principles completely vindicated—her faithfulness and loyalty to Heaven’s King gloriously recompensed—and all, for which she had laboured, suffered, and bled, firmly secured and pronounced unalterable for ever,—lo ! a voice from heaven, saying, “cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils.”

Though the Protestant ascendancy had now been firmly established, there existed a powerful party, either wholly Popish or Popishly inclined, which was silenced but not subdued, far less extinguished. Those who composed it,—from their infatuated love of arbitrary power, in Church and State, and intense devotion to the cause of the Pretender, whom they longed and struggled to set up as the Royal symbol and representative of such power, under the title of James VIII.—were significantly enough called JACOBITES. Exasperated beyond measure at their own signal defeat, and the not less signal triumph of their old antagonists, they resolved to leave no scheme untried to regain their lost influence and power. Clubs were formed and secret conventions held, for the hatching of desperate plots and seditious designs—cemented by the sanction of unhallowed oaths. Secret leagues and conspiracies were entered into; feuds and jealousies and dissatisfaction were, with dexterous subtilty, fomented; and a treasonable correspondence was opened with the Papists of France which terminated in an actual invasion of the Kingdom.

Against all such machinations, no subjects of the British Crown offered a more sturdy and strenuous resistance than the Ministers, Elders, and Members of the freely constituted Church of Scotland. Hence, the Queen, in her letter to the General Assembly of 1708, acknowledged in the warmest terms her “satisfaction with the zeal and affection, which the Ministers had shewn to her person and government.” While the Earl of Seafield expressly declared that their loyalty to her Majesty’s person and government, and zeal in support of the Protestant faith, “rendered all the Presbyterians very acceptable to her Majesty.”

But, in proportion to the value and extent of their services to the cause of Protestantism was the hatred and aversion excited towards them on the part of the Popish faction. By one of its leaders they were openly denounced as “plagues, growing evils and incarnate devils.” At length, through their wiles and artifices, the Queen herself was partially gained over, and they gradually obtained a preponderant influence in the Supreme Councils of the nation. A ministry was formed consisting of scarcely disguised papists, semi-papists, and avowed infidels—with the infamous Bolingbroke at their head;—a ministry, of whom one of their immediate successors in office, declared that, “notwithstanding all the endeavours which had been used to prevent a discovery of the late mismanagement, by conveying away several papers from the Secretary’s office, yet the Government had sufficient evidence to prove the late ministry *the most corrupt that ever sat at the helm.*” A ministry, so constituted, was not likely to be very scrupulous in its measures. The supreme object of its ambition was, any how, to secure a Popish, instead of a Protestant, ascendancy and succession. But the insuperable—the mountain-like barrier, that stood in their way, was the free and the fearless Church of Scotland, with its popular constitution and heroic ardour in the cause of civil and religious liberty. Too powerful to be openly or vigorously assailed, this formidable obstacle was to be approached by strata-



getic and gradually undermining processes. With artifice and treachery the most consummate, they made the Royal letter to the Assembly of 1711, the vehicle of the most friendly professions—declaring their confident hope that “care would be taken to plant vacant Churches with learned, diligent, and pious ministers, to promote religion, to suppress vice and impiety, and prevent the growth of Popery and Atheism”—volunteering the assurance, that “nothing would be wanting on the part of her Majesty to convince them of her royal intentions to maintain them in the full possession of their rights and privileges as by law established;”—and all this, at the very moment when they were busily engaged in concocting a series of insidious measures, with the express and deliberate intent of ultimately subverting the constitution and liberties of the Church, and thereby effectually paving the way for a new reign of civil and spiritual despotism !

Accordingly, when, by smooth words and flattering speeches, they imagined they had succeeded in disarming the Church of all fears, and lulling its members asleep, suddenly and without any note of warning, on the 13th March 1712, Mr. Murray, afterwards created, by the Pretender, Lord Dunbar, rose up in the House of Commons and proposed the first of the measures which had been hatched in secret by the Popish Conspirators.—viz., a Bill for the restoration of the Law of Patronage, which had been *formally abolished at the Revolution, and the abolition of which was solemnly ratified and declared to be unalterable for ever by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union!* Such was the indecent haste, with which this scandalous and profligate measure—in utter violation of the oaths of Monarchs, the guarantee of Parliaments, and the faith of National Treaties, which even the barbarous hordes of an American wilderness have been known to respect—was hurried through the House of Commons and the House of Lords, that, *in little more than a month*, the Bill received the Royal assent, and passed into a Law of the Land ! A more glaring breach of national compact—a more aggravated instance of national perjury—the annals of mankind do not supply. And, as if it were not enough to be guilty of a breach of national faith, and consequently guilty of national perjury, there must be superadded, an act of national robbery. For, notwithstanding the advantageous concessions made by Parliament to the Patrons at the Revolution Settlement, this Bill “took back from the Church the power of presentation of Ministers, without restoring the tithes which formerly belonged to her, by which the Patrons came to *enjoy both the purchase and price.*” As if a person, after purchasing certain commodities, would send them away, and then, watching a favourable opportunity, would seize upon the money that had been paid for them, and run away with it too ! And yet,—simply for opposing this atrocious Bill—resisting it, and denouncing it as it deserves,—the people of Scotland must needs be calumniated as despisers of law, and rebels against the State !

The instant that tidings of this disastrous retrograde movement reached Edinburgh, Commissioners were despatched to London, with

a strong remonstrance from the aggrieved Church of Scotland. But, in those days of less facile means of locomotion, they did not reach the metropolis, till the Bill had passed the Commons, and was before the Lords. The Commissioners presented an address, in which they calmly but resolutely protested against the proposed Bill, as plainly "contrary to the present constitution of the Church, so well secured by the late Treaty of Union, and solemnly ratified by the Acts of Parliament in both Kingdoms"—as, in reality, nullifying "the late Treaty of Union in one of its most fundamental and essential articles, respecting the preservation of the rights and privileges, which the Church at that time was possessed of by law, for the security of which the Parliament of Scotland was so much concerned, as not to allow their Commissioners to make it any part of their Treaty, but reserved it as a thing unalterable by any judicature deriving its constitution from the said Treaty." But all protests and remonstrances were vain. A reckless faction, bent on desperate ends, turned a deaf ear to every entreaty. Reason and justice were discarded as empty baubles. National faith and National Treaties were blown away, as if they were so many filaments of gossamer. "I pressed," said Lockhart of Carnwarth, the celebrated leader of the Scottish Jacobites, "I pressed the Patronage Act more earnestly, that I thought the Presbyterian Clergy would be from thence convinced that the establishment of their Kirk would, in time, be overturned, as it was obvious that the security thereof was not so thoroughly established by the Union as they imagined." To their credit, it must be recorded, that of the Bishops, present on the occasion in the House of Lords, *five* voted against the Bill. And when the Elector of Hanover, afterwards George I., heard of it, "he expressed his dislike of it, as what would break his best friends in Scotland."

That this disgraceful Bill was in direct violation of the Treaty of Union, does not appear from the unanimous opinion of Scotch Ecclesiastics alone. In reference to it, Sir David Dalrymple, one of the Commissioners for the said Treaty, and then Solicitor General, thus remarks:—"Certainly some men's proceedings give us reason to suspect that they will leave no article of the Union unattempted, when they are for breaking in thus upon the rights and privileges of the Church of Scotland, which are made an essential and fundamental condition of the Union, and are secured by the Treaty from any deduction of, or derogation therefrom, in any sort, for ever." The Lord President Dundas who had been also a distinguished Commissioner for the Union, avers in the most absolute manner that the Act of the Revolution Settlement, abolishing Patronage, was comprehended in the Act of Security, "which by the Parliaments of both Kingdoms, was ratified and declared to be a fundamental and essential condition of the Union in all time coming"—that, "in prejudice of that Security, which in all its parts was as great and as solemn as it was possible for human laws and constitutions to devise and to execute, the Act of Queen Anne restoring Patronage was passed"—and that "it was well known, and had always been declared, that this Act was imposed

upon this Church by means of persons of our country, who were enemies of the Protestant succession; as they soon afterwards discovered in the strongest manner, and enemies to the Church, by reason of her inviolable adherence to that succession, and was by them intended to afflict and oppress this Church, and to create discontents among the people therein, and to open a door for patrons arbitrarily to impose upon the people as ministers, persons proper for instilling into their minds principles of disloyalty and disaffection to the present happy constitution." Again, Dr. Hutcheson, the celebrated Author of a System of Moral Philosophy, pronounces the Act "a most direct breach of the most solemn public faith in the Articles of Union," adding:—"Thus, matters continued in a very peaceable easy manner, till the year 1711, when the late Queen's Ministry, intending to defeat the Hanover succession, took all methods to harass such as were firmly attached to it, which the Presbyterian Clergy and gentry ever were, both from principle and interest. An Act, therefore, was obtained, restoring Patrons to their power, though in the most direct opposition to the Articles of the Union, and the public faith of the nation, then given in that sacred Treaty upon which is founded his Majesty's title to the Crown of Scotland, and the very Parliament of Great Britain itself." Once more, Bishop Burnet, in the History of his own Times, thus writes:—"It was set up by Presbyterians from their first beginnings as a principle, that parishes had, from warrants in Scripture, a right to choose their Ministers; so they had always looked on the right of Patronage as an invasion made on that. It was therefore urged, that since by the Act of Union, Presbytery, with all its rights and privileges, was unalterably secured; the taking from them the right of choosing their Ministers was contrary to that Act. By these steps, the Presbyterians were alarmed, when they saw in the success of every motion that was made, *a design to weaken and undermine their establishment.*"

So utterly obnoxious was this measure to the people of Scotland, as an infringement on their spiritual liberties, deriving, as it did, its origin from the hostile designs and machinations of a Popish coalition—and so utterly repugnant to all sense of honour and justice, as an infraction of National faith and solemn Treaties—that, for *twenty* years, no Patron dared formally to act upon it. Even after that period, Patrons frequently allowed, or felt themselves constrained to allow, the people freely to choose their own pastor. About a quarter of a century after the passing of the Act, Professor Hutcheson testifies that "the direct pleading for Patronages in Scotland was so odious to all men of piety, that not one of the clergy, not a king's chaplain, or politician clergyman among them, dared to open his mouth in favour of them in their Assemblies and Synods—and that all honest men among the clergy abhorred them." In short, the re-imposition of Patronage, by violating National faith, and disfranchising nine-tenths of the property and worth of the country, was universally regarded as an insult to the people—a contempt of the landed

gentry and intelligent Eldership of every Parish—and a subjection of the nearest and dearest interests of Scotsmen to Ministers of State, political partizans, court favourites, absentee lords, rakes and infidels, “who might have no property or interest in their parishes, and no concern for the glory of God and the salvation of souls.” It was, accordingly, vigorously remonstrated against by the Church, and firmly resisted by the people—while the most eminent literary men and most celebrated lawyers of those days zealously rushed into the field to vindicate the wounded honour, and assert the violated rights of their Church and nation.

The General Assembly continued to manifest an earnestness and anxiety proportioned to its sense of the flagrant enormity that had been so daringly perpetrated. They unanimously sent addresses, representations, remonstrances and protests to her Majesty the Queen, and to the Peers and Commons of Great Britain, in Parliament assembled :—but all in vain. On George’s accession to the throne in 1715, they renewed in the most vigorous terms their testimony against Patronage—as subversive of the legal constitution and establishment which had been unalterably secured by the Treaty of Union—as alike inequitable in itself, and incompatible with the liberty of a Christian and a free people—as proving the source of the greatest abuses and the cause of greatest hindrance to the progress of the gospel ;—but all in vain. They sent deputation after deputation to the metropolis, with importunate and reiterated addresses to the Crown and both Houses of Parliament ;—but all in vain. After the first secession from the Church took place in 1733, as the first bitter fruits of that harvest of bitterness, which has since been reaped from the imposition of so unendurable a yoke, protests and remonstrances were renewed with augmented energy ;—but all in vain. All endeavours to get rid of the heavy burden and grievance, which was ever and anon denounced as an infringement of the Constitution solemnly guaranteed by National covenant and compact, having thus proved abortive, the Assembly in 1736, by “their solemn and deliberate resolution, gave it as their judgment, that it was still most just and fit, upon the first favourable occasion, to apply for redress of the grievance ;” and recorded their weighty grounds and reasons for it, in an elaborate statement, which was draughted by no less distinguished a personage than the Lord President of the Court of Session. At the same time, so earnest and determined was the Assembly in the matter, that special and stringent instructions were given to its Commission to seize any and every opportunity of obtaining the desired redress of the intolerable grievance, if any occasion should occur for so doing, previous to the meeting of another Assembly. And this formal and official protest against the odious law of Patronage, with its accompanying instructions, continued to be lifted up, year after year till 1784 ; when the practice of the Church Courts having, alas, come to be at utter variance with her own avowed and uncanceled principles, the formal protest was dropped. But, even then, it was a simple ces-

sation or relinquishment of an apparently fruitless and hopeless endeavour. For, as has been remarked, "it remains a fact in history that the Church of Scotland *never, never*, by any official or judicial act, *acquiesced in the restoration of Patronage.*"

Who can help admiring the holy jealousy, the unslumbering and unwearied strenuousness, with which our Fathers watched over the minutest as well as the greatest of those rights and privileges, which they believed the great Head of the Church to have conferred on its professing members? In the present instance, the great citadel of the Supreme Headship of the Divine Redeemer was not *formally, directly*, or in *express terms*, assailed. But an important outpost, reciprocally supporting and supported thereby, was attacked and partially dismantled. And what loyal and trusty warrior of the cross could fail to discern in this, a deadly blow, aimed ultimately at the central citadel itself, and threatening its safety and security?—And how could he fail, from all his watch towers to sound the note of alarm, lest it should prove the first of a series of assaults that might terminate in undermining or carrying by storm the citadel itself? The spiritual and independent jurisdiction of the Church, as it flows necessarily from the doctrine of the Supreme Headship of Christ, was not *directly*, or *formally*, or in *express terms*, assailed. But a measure was carried, whose inevitable *tendency* was, gradually to call into being a race of "time-serving, self-seeking, and subservient clergy," who might present few or no obstacles in the way of any intended or actual invasion of such scriptural and independent Discipline and Government. Moreover, by that measure, one of the dearest of the blood-bought privileges of Christ's people, was, if not wholly subverted, yet deeply affected and seriously injured. And who could tell, how soon that first wound, though not fatal itself, might be followed by the infliction of another, and another, still more deadly?

The Church of Scotland, from the very first dawn of its existence as a nationally reformed Church, adopted it as an article of faith derived from Scripture and an essential point in its scheme of Ecclesiastical Polity, that the people, as members of an organized spiritual Society of which Christ is the Head, have the right and the privilege to be consulted in the election of office-bearers—that, in some form or other, direct or indirect, positive or negative, their consent, or at the very least, the absence of dissent, is essential to the formation of the pastoral relationship—and that, consequently, no pastor should be intruded on them against their will. Except in times of downright persecution, this is a doctrine or principle which the Church always strenuously upheld, and to which it uniformly gave practical effect in the degree and manner which the pressure of external circumstances might best admit. Never, never during the seasons of the Church's peaceful establishment, did patronage exist in an unmodified, unrestricted, unmitigated form. Even when not formally expunged from the Statute Book, it was invariably subjected to such checks and limitations as served to neutralise the evil, and effectually prevent unacceptable pastors from been violently forced on a reclaiming congregation.

This being the chief point to be practically attained, it was always held a matter of comparatively less importance, with whom the *initiative* in the choice of a Minister lay,—provided always that it lay within the Church itself, and was vested in duly qualified Christian men. Accordingly, when, in 1649, the Parliament formally abolished “Patronages and presentations of Kirks,” on the express ground of their being “an evil and bondage, founded only on the canon law—a custom popish, brought into the kirk in time of ignorance and superstition,—unlawful and unwarranted by God’s word, and contrary to the doctrine and liberties of this kirk”—adding, with emphasis, that the planting of kirks was to proceed entirely “upon the suit and calling, or with the consent of the congregation, on whom none was to be obtruded against their will”—the Church herself devised and adopted a Directory for the election of Ministers, in which the *initiative* was vested in the Session or Eldership,—that is, the spiritual representatives of the congregation who were most competent to judge of the qualifications of a man, whom they were to receive as a pastor and friend ;—at the same time, ordaining the acquiescence or consent of the latter, as indispensable to the validity of a settlement. Again, the Act that abolished Patronage as “a great and insupportable grievance and trouble” at the Revolution Settlement, vested the *initiative* in the Protestant Heritors and Elders of the parish,—that is, in the intelligent body of Christian men that were most deeply interested in a right choice, as that essentially involved the temporal and spiritual welfare of themselves and their people—entirely subject, however, to the approval or disapproval of the “whole congregation.” What, then, was the precise object accomplished by the Act of Queen Anne, which, in utter violation of the Act of Security and Treaty of Union, restored the intolerable yoke of Patronage? It was exactly this :—It transferred the *initiative* from a responsible body of Christian men, who really knew and actually represented the temporal and spiritual interests of the people, to a single irresponsible Lay Patron, who, as has been strongly but truly said, “might be a Jew, an infidel, an excommunicated person, a fool, a fanatic, a total stranger.” This was the introduction of a new and heterogeneous element into the Polity of the Church, as unconstitutional as it was unscriptural—as contrary to the faith of National Treaties as to the unchanging spirit and substance of the everlasting Covenant. The entrance and admixture of this strange ingredient threatened to prove the Achan, whose presence might excite the fierceness of Jehovah’s anger, and cause the hearts of the people to melt, and become as water—the sour and bitter leaven that might pervade and deteriorate the whole lump—the subtle edge of the wedge that might force its way towards the heart, till the entire fabric was riven asunder.

Here, however, it must be specially noted,—and in the present controversy it is a point of paramount importance—that while the Act, restoring Patronages, transferred the initiative privilege of *proposing*, from the qualified Christian representatives of a parish to the unqua-

lified Lay Patrons, whose *right* it was to *present*, it did not render the latter *absolute* or *unqualified*. Quite the reverse. The Act—which, in defiance of the Treaty of Union, so iniquitously wrested the “bland and patriarchal” privilege of proposing, from the parish representatives, and vested it in the roughest and least gracious form, in the hands of strangers and aliens—left altogether untouched and unrepealed all the other Acts, which had been revived at the Revolution Settlement, and ratified and confirmed by the Treaty of Union,—Acts which, in the hands of a faithful Christian Ministry, tended greatly to control and mitigate the evils of Patronage, inasmuch as they left it entirely with the Church judicatories to judge of every thing connected with the examination and admission,\* the qualifications and specific fitness of the presentee for the charge to which he was presented—while, from their decision, there was no appeal to any Civil Courts whatsoever;—and, inasmuch as these same Acts enjoined it on Presbyteries, “to put order to all matters and causes ecclesiastical within their bounds, *according to the Discipline of the kirk*,”—an essential and integral part of which Discipline it was, “that no person should be intruded into any offices of the kirk, contrary to the will of the congregation.”

That this is no forced or unwarranted inference of later days, but has been the constant and invariable creed of the Church of Scotland—aye, and, as long as she was faithful, her invariable practice too—a

\* Even Sir James Graham, who, throughout the recent controversy has shewn himself so hostile to the claims of the Church, felt *constrained*, in the Debate in the House of Commons, 31st July last, to make the following important admissions:—“It was well known that, from the earliest period of the Reformation in Scotland, the question of Lay Patronage was a subject of great jealousy amongst all classes in that country. The earliest converts to the Reformation in Scotland were the middle classes, and they felt particularly sensitive on the question of Lay Patronage, which, at that time, had got into the hands of the Crown and the Aristocracy. Its exercise was viewed by them with, as he had said, extreme jealousy. *In the Books of Discipline of the Church of Scotland, the Doctrine of Non-Intrusion by a presentee against the wish of the parishioners was laid down.*” “He would admit that the Act of Queen Anne, repealed to a *certain extent* the Act of 1690. This was a disputed question among many Lawyers in Scotland; but he (Sir J. Graham,) looking at the Act of Queen Anne, as a whole, could not conceive, that it made any alteration in the principles, he had mentioned as those of the Act, 1690; *at least the manner of admission of Ministers to the Church, remained the same.* The Patronage was *so far changed*, that it was taken from the Presbytery, and was vested in the Crown and Lay Patrons, but he repeated, that the *principle of admission to the Church, remained unaltered.* He would admit that, *after the Act of Queen Anne, the custom continued of the Patrons consulting the feelings and wishes of the parishioners in their nominations; and though the nomination was made by the Patron, the parishioners exercised a very considerable control over the choice of the Minister.* *In the lapse of time, however, a change took place, which he certainly did not think was for the better; for by it the feelings and wishes of the parishioners were not consulted as they ought to have been.* This was regarded by the Church as a great grievance, and was the cause of a partial secession from the great body. Up to the year 1784, an address was annually agreed to by the General Assembly, in which they complained of Lay Patronage as a crying grievance, &c.”

creed and a practice acquiesced in, also, without one dissentient voice, or one adverse precedent, by the Civil Power, from the passing of the Act of Queen Anne down to the recent adverse decisions in the celebrated Auchterarder case—is clear from indisputable legal, historical and documentary evidence. It is a *fact*, that, until within the last few years, the Patronage Act was not interpreted, as taking away the civil sanction from the powers recognized in the Act 1690, to be inherent in Presbyteries, as the proper parties by whom “the affair,” (i. e. the whole affair of the proposed Minister’s admission and settlement) was to be cognosced upon,” and “at whose judgment, and by whose determination, the calling and entry of a particular Minister is to be ordered and concluded.” It is a *fact*, that the Patronage Act was never understood as rendering it necessary to change the prescribed form of a “call” from the congregation to the presentee as indispensable to the formation of the pastoral tie, or the style and substance of the subsequent ordination service and vows—and that, consequently, both of these, involving expressly the “advice and consent of the people,” as well as “the concurrence of the Presbytery,” have actually come down, as the “constitutional and consuetudinary” practice of the Church, to the present day. It is a *fact*, that till the middle of last century, “it was a very general practice for Presbyteries to moderate in calls at large, and by no means with a limitation to the presentee of the Patron,” and that they did this without let, hindrance, or challenge on the part of the Civil Power. It is a *fact*, that “the Church Courts did, for a long succession of years, exert an inherent power in setting aside presentees on grounds altogether distinct from objections to mere *Life, Literature and Doctrine*—and that the right of so doing was not in a single instance canvassed by any Civil Court.”\* It is a *fact*, for example, that Presbyteries, “during the last

\* It is worthy of being noted that the first adverse decision in the House of Lords in the recent celebrated Auchterarder case, was very much based by the Law Lords on a restriction of the terms “duly qualified” to *technical qualifications* connected with *Life, Literature, and Doctrine*. And it is not less worthy of being noted that one of the main objects of Lord Aberdeen’s Bill,—passed subsequent to the disruption of the Church, in consequence of a series of encroachments of which that first decision laid the train—was, legislatively to declare that *to be law* which the Law Lords had judicially pronounced *not to be law*! On this point, let us again hear Sir James Graham, in the debate of July last:—“In passing, he would ask the House to observe, to bear in mind, that the *rigid construction* of the word “qualification” *restricted* the consideration of the Presbytery to three points; viz. *Life, Learning, and Doctrine*. There was a *more extended construction*, which in his letter (to the Moderator of the General Assembly) he *admitted*; and which *allowed of the consideration, whether the presentee be FIT AND SUITABLE to his congregation*. He was under the disadvantage of not speaking as a lawyer, but he apprehended that the three questions to which he had referred, arising out of the *restricted* interpretation of the term “qualification,” viz. *Life, Learning, and Doctrine*, might be, as it was termed in Scottish law, *libelled*. During the judgment delivered in the Auchterarder case, certain noble Lords in the other House, of high legal authority, used various arguments, and expressed various opinions with respect to the law of Scotland, involving and this point among others, “What under the



century, often refused to induct presentees, upon the very same grounds on which they refuse to induct them now, namely, *the dissent of the people*—and that, so firmly was it believed that the Civil Courts could not interfere, that they never attempted to interfere, even to the effect in such cases of denying civil consequences to the Act of the Church Courts rejecting a presentee, in respect of the dissent of the people.”

It is a *fact*, that, under a full consciousness of such remaining inherent powers, the General Assembly of 1736, aided as it was in its deliberations by the then Lord President of the Court of Session, passed, not an enacting but a declaratory Act, against the Intrusion of unacceptable Ministers—an Act, the competency of which was never once called in question by the Civil Powers—an Act, which became the grand model and exemplar of the celebrated declaratory Act, known under the name of the Veto Law of 1834. After quoting the Acts and Statutes of Assembly and of Parliament, the Act of 1736 concludes that, from all these it is indisputable, that “it is, and has been, since the Reformation, the principle of this Church, that no minister be intruded into any parish contrary to the will of the congregation, and therefore seriously recommends to all the judicatories of the Church to have a due regard to the said principle in planting vacant congregations, and that all Presbyteries be at pains to bring about harmony and unanimity in congregations; and to avoid every thing that may excite or encourage unreasonable exceptions in people against a worthy person, that may be proposed to be their Minister in the present situation and circumstances of the Church, so as none be intruded into such parishes, as they regard the glory of God, and edification of the body of Christ.”

It is a *fact*, that, several years subsequent to the passing of this declaratory Act of Assembly, the famous Willison could, in his “Fair and Impartial Testimony,” without fear of contradiction, boldly proclaim it as an incontrovertible truth, that “there was no law yet in being that obligeth us to intrude men into Churches: for, though there be an Act passed in 1712, for restoring Patronages, yet it doth expressly reserve to the Presbytery and Church Judicatories, the power of judging of the presentees’ qualifications and fitness for the charge to which he is presented. Now, the power of judging of a man’s qualifications must not be restricted to those which render him fit for the ministry in general, but also be extended to qualifications necessary to

Statute constituted qualification?” and declared in favour of the restrictive interpretation of the term. These opinions, CONTRARY TO PRESBYTERIAN PRACTICE AND FEELINGS, caused considerable regret and excitement in Scotland; and a noble colleague of his, a member of the Presbyterian Church (Lord Aberdeen) dissenting from this narrow construction of the term “qualification,” introduced a Bill, (he not then being a member of Government, but acting in his individual capacity), for the purpose of giving a wider construction to the term, for which wider construction he (Sir J. Graham) now contended. For the reasons he had stated, the Government was prepared to adhere to the principles of the Bill, with certain modifications, introduced by Lord Aberdeen, when out of office.”

make him fit for being minister of the parish to which he is presented ; because a man may be fit and qualified for one charge, that is not so for another. Now, if a Presbytery do find that a presentee is incapable of answering the end of a Gospel-minister to a parish, and is in no condition to instruct or edify their souls, by reason of his offending them, or their incurable aversion to hear him, or submit to his ministry ; they may safely judge that such a man is not qualified, nor fit to be settled in that parish, and therefore may set him aside. And if, in case of an appeal, the Assembly affirm the Presbytery's sentence, the law is most express and clear, that the cause *must take end* as the Assembly doth decern."

It is a *fact*, that, as if to render any pretence for interference with the purely spiritual jurisdiction of the Church, impossible, one of the unrepealed Acts made special and express provision for the supposable case of illegal settlements, to the effect that if any such should occur, the legal penalty would be a forfeiture to the Church of the temporal fruits of the benefice, during the life time of the presentee—so that if the Presbytery ordained another to the pastoral charge of the parish, they and the congregation must support him as they best could. Yea, it is accordingly a *fact*, that,—even in cases in which the Presbyteries, "not confining themselves to the ecclesiastical questions in regard to the admission of a Minister, took it upon them to decide who was the Patron, and admitted those presentees who were not presented by the proper Patrons—that, even in such cases, when the Church Courts unquestionably went beyond their own province, the Civil Courts never attempted or pretended to direct or coerce the Church Courts, in the exercise of their (spiritual) functions in regard to the collation of Ministers or other matters acknowledged by the State to have been conferred on the Church, not by the State, but by God himself—that, on the contrary, they limited their decrees to the regulation and disposal of the temporalities which were derived from the State, and which, as the proper subjects of 'actions civil' were within the province assigned to the Court of Session by the Constitution, refusing to interfere with the peculiar functions and exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of the Church." Till within the last six years, there was no exception to this uniform and uninterrupted procedure on the part of the Civil Courts. In every instance even of arbitrary, wrongful, or illegal settlement brought before them, their decrees invariably ran in some such strain as the following:—"Find that the right to a stipend is a civil right ; and, therefore, that the Court have power to cognosce and determine upon the legality of the admission of Ministers *in hunc effectum, whether the person admitted have a right to the stipend or not.*" Or, again, the Court, "refuse as *incompetent* a Bill of advocation presented to them by the Patron, for the purpose of staying the admission by the Presbytery of another than the presentee." Or, once more, the Court "decline to interfere in regard to a conclusion to prohibit the Presbytery to moderate in a call at large or settle any other man, because that was interfering with

the power of ordination or internal policy of the Church, with which the Lords thought they had nothing to do.”\*

From all these *facts*, individually and collectively, the conclusion is clear and irresistible, that—“while the Church protested against the passing of the Act of Queen Anne, as ‘contrary to the constitution of the Church, so well secured by the Treaty of Union, and solemnly ratified by Acts of Parliament in both Kingdoms,’ and, for more than seventy years thereafter, uninterruptedly sought for its repeal,—she, at the same time, maintained and practically exercised, without question or challenge from any quarter, the jurisdiction of her Courts to determine ultimately and exclusively, under what circumstances they would admit candidates into the office of the holy ministry, or constitute the pastoral relationship between minister and people; and, generally, to order and conclude the entry of particular ministers.” Or, to sum up the whole in a few words:—By Popish and Jacobite treachery, the people and their representatives were violently deprived of a clearly defined constitutional right as well as scriptural privilege, in the vital matter of electing to the pastoral office. Still, the intrinsic power of the Church’s office-bearers, assembled in their various courts, as derived directly from her great Head, were left wholly unimpaired. Such remaining powers, founded on the Word of God and expressly recognized by Statute Law, rendered it practicable effectually to shield the injured people, at least to the extent of preventing an unqualified or unacceptable presentee from being forced or intruded upon them against their will. And this protecting barrier the Church Courts did, in point of fact, actually interpose with complete success, without let or hindrance on the part of the Civil Power, so long as they were faithful to their own constitution, and sacred trust, and solemnly ratified scriptural privileges.

But alas, a new era was now approaching. About the middle of last century the blight and the mildew of lukewarmness, and cold indifference began to settle down on all the Reformed Churches. And the withering and degenerating influence went on increasing and multiplying into all the varieties and forms of a disguised or avowed infidelity, till the earthquake-shock of the French Revolution arrested the nations in their guilty career,—forced them to pause on the brink of

\* In regard to the *merits* of the recent Church controversy in Scotland, as far as the *law* of the case is concerned, those who are interested in the subject will find a clear, satisfactory, and conclusive statement in a recent pamphlet, published by Macleod Wylie, Esq., Barrister at Law, entitled “The Scotch Law of Patronage and the Recent Secession.” From this work it will be seen that the seceding party were as indisputably *right in law* as they were in *Scripture*. In a Review of this work which has appeared in the November No. of the *Jurist*, there will be found an additional *confirmatory legal opinion* by the able and talented Editor of that most useful Journal. And, when it is remembered that both of these authors are *neither Scotchmen nor Presbyterians*, their impartial and disinterested professional opinions must be entitled to the greatest possible weight.

the precipice—and to gaze with horror at the terrible abyss into which they were about to plunge. The Church and people of Scotland could not wholly escape the predominant tendencies of the age. And there, moreover, in addition to these general tendencies, the abhorred Patronage Act began, gradually at first and almost imperceptibly, to instil its insidious poison into the very heart of the Ecclesiastical fabric. Then, began to be verified the not less pointed than just remark of Sir Walter Scott:—"The Act," says he, "which restored to Patrons the right of presenting clergymen to vacant Churches, was designed to render the Churchmen more dependent on the Aristocracy, and to separate them, in some degree, from their congregations, who could not be supposed to be equally attached to, or influenced by, a minister who held his living by the gift of a great man, as by one who was chosen by their own free voice." Then, too, began to be realized the fatal result so distinctly anticipated by Wodrow, the Historian. In a letter to a friend shortly after the passing of the Patronage Act, he thus writes:—"I do not see that any smoothings in this affair will do. Restricting of Patrons (if the people be forfaulted of their just right,) or obliging them to take the consent of Presbyteries before they present a minister already fixed to a congregation, *will but line the yoke, and make it sit closer to our necks, and perpetuate it upon us and posterity.*"

As this process of religious indifference and pastoral degeneracy advanced, the clergy began to manifest a growing disregard to the feelings and the rights of the Christian people, and more and more decided leanings towards the views and wishes of the Patrons. Their hearts and affections, gradually loosened from the former, went on gravitating with accelerated speed towards the latter. What was the natural—the inevitable consequence? It was this:—That the Church Courts, under such chilling and noxious influences, ceased to be faithful to the cause of Zion's King and the best interests of Zion's children. No new laws were imposed on them by the State; no interferences whatever, on the part of Civil Courts, disturbed them; their own principles and constitutional rights they did not formally alter or renounce;—what, then, was the cause of all the declensions, violent settlements, and alarming secessions that followed in swift succession? The sole and indisputable cause was, that a prevailing party in the Church Courts—practically forgetting the Doctrine of the Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, and their consequent practical allegiance to Him as their sole Head and King, and obligation to the subjects of his Kingdom and members of his Body,—resolved to keep their own principles and rights in abeyance,—resolved, not to exercise their own still remaining intrinsic powers for the protection of the people,—resolved, practically to neglect or depart from their own constitutional duties,—resolved, to suffer some of those scriptural and statutory privileges, which they might and ought to have employed in defence of their helpless and fast scattering flocks, to drop into desuetude,—resolved, to wrest and pervert some of their other scriptural and statutory privileges into instruments of violence,

for extending the provisions of an obnoxious law beyond all reasonable construction—far beyond all former precedent—yea, far beyond, all power of endurance. This was pre-eminently the dark age of the Church of Scotland. In all former trials, the sufferings of the faithful were the glory of the Church; they were now emphatically her shame. Formerly, the sufferings sprung from faithless Monarchs and persecuting Civil Courts; now, they flowed entirely from faithless Pastors and tyrannizing Church Courts. And, to nail the truth and certainty of this representation into the stablest pillars of the fabric of history, it stands in documentary record, that the earliest Seceders from the Church, “were not in the habit of complaining so much of the law of Patronage, as of the sin of the Church Courts in stretching it beyond its due bounds, and neglecting to use their own inherent powers, in preventing violent settlements.” After proving, as they were wont to do, by reference to ratified and unrepealed statutes, “that judicatories were under no force by law to make intrusions or violent settlements,” their simple, but touching and resistless appeal ordinarily ran thus:—“Why, then, should Churchmen, who ought to be the guardians of the Church’s liberties, go about to destroy them by violent proceedings? Is it not soon enough for Church Courts to take such destructive courses when the Parliament makes new laws obliging them to it\*?”

\* On re-perusing a whole volume of Protests and Judicial Testimonies by the holy and devoted men who, during the latter half of last century, were compelled to secede from the Establishment, I have been more struck than ever with the remarkable singularity of the fact, that throughout, there is *no trace of a complaint of any encroachment or vexatious annoyance on the part of any of the CIVIL COURTS, whether subordinate or supreme, in consequence of the Patronage Act.* On the contrary, the whole burden of their complaint and testimony is *against the principles and proceedings of what they denominate, “the prevailing party in the judicatories of the Church.”* The chief heads of their protesting testimony, which they illustrate with a redundancy of the most appalling details, are usually the following:—That “the prevailing party in the judicatories of the Church of Scotland, particularly in her Assemblies and Commissions, are breaking down the fences wisely set up against innovations in Discipline and Government—are pursuing such measures as practically corrupt, or have a direct tendency to corrupt the doctrine of our excellent standards—are restraining ministerial freedom, and faithfulness in testifying against these sinful and church-ruining courses;—that these corrupt courses are carried on with a high hand, notwithstanding that the ordinary means have been used to reclaim them, and to stop the current of their defection and backsliding—that Church-authority is screwed to an exorbitant height—that the regular exercise of Government and Discipline, according to the word of God, and acts and constitutions of this Church, are grown into desuetude—that many, who profess friendship to the principles of the constitution, acquiesce in the most rigorous and oppressive administrations—that a lordly and magisterial power is exercised over the flock and heritage of God—that the violent intrusion of ministers, even of worthless characters, upon a dissenting and reclaiming people, is sinfully persevered in, whereby the great end and design of a gospel ministry, in the edification of souls, is defeated, innumerable divisions and convulsions in the body of Christ occasioned, the spirit of the godly grieved, and their affections alienated, and the peace and unity of the Church broken and ruined.” “Therefore,” conclude these devoted servants of God, after ad-

The faithful minority, from their unabated *zeal* in defence of "the faith once delivered to the saints," the scriptural and civilly ratified constitution of the Church, and the rights and privileges of the Christian people, were familiarly known under the stigmatizing appellation

ducing the overwhelming evidence of *facts* in proof of these aggravated charges, "therefore, it is not only necessary for us, but *present duty*, to make a *secession* from the said *prevailing party*, till they see the sins they are guilty of, and the mischiefs that they are under, and reform and amend the same." But continue they, "*our secession is not from the Church of Scotland; we own her Doctrine contained in her Confession of Faith; we adhere to her covenanted Presbyterian Church-government, discipline, and worship: neither is our secession from those who are cleaving unto our covenanted principles, and who are affected by the grievances we complain of, and are in their several spheres wrestling against the same; but it is from a party who have got the management in their hands, and who have got the majority on their side in the judicatories, particularly in our Assemblies and Commissions, and who are carrying on a course of defection from our reformed and covenanted principles, and are suppressing ministerial freedom and faithfulness in testifying against their present back slidings, by inflicting censures upon ministers for witnessing, by protestation and otherwise, against the same.*" For these reasons, "*our Secession is from the present judicatories of the Established Church, in full consistency with the most steady attachment to all her avowed principles and constitution.*"

For the sake of those readers who may be unacquainted with the lamentable history of the Church of Scotland, under the frightful despotism of the "*prevailing party*" of the *Moderates*, during the latter half of last century, it may be well to furnish one or two *examples* or *specimens* of those *forced settlements of pastors*, which tended so mightily to re-introduce the ferocities of a savage barbarism into the rapidly improving Kingdom of Scotland. For this purpose, the following extract from a late Tract by Dr. Cunningham of Edinburgh will suffice:—"Perhaps," says he, "we could give no better proof of the injurious tendency of intrusion, of its thorough fitness to raise up the most formidable obstacles to the success of the Gospel, to harden men's hearts,—to prejudice them against the means of grace,—to frustrate the great ends of the Christian ministry, and to spread irreligion and vice over the land, than by describing two or three cases in which the Church-Courts forced a minister upon a reclaiming people. We do not mean to express approbation of all that the people did in these cases, but we do not hesitate to say that, whatever blame may attach to the people, their guilt is as nothing compared with that of the Church-Courts who commanded and perpetrated such enormities.

An ordained minister was, in 1752, presented to the parish of Nigg, in the Presbytery of Tain. The people of the parish were unanimously and decidedly opposed to him. The affair was several times before the Assembly, who, in 1755, ordered the settlement of the presentee. The Presbytery resolved to make a last attempt to gain some concurrence, on the part of the people, and appointed a committee to deal with them for that purpose. The committee reported that they had done all they could to persuade the people to receive the presentee, but that "the whole elders and people declared that they never would accede to the settlement of Mr. Patrick Grant, as minister of their parish,—that they neither would witness his admission, nor ever afterwards hear him, nor any that should join in his admission;—that it was wormwood and gall to them to hear of that proposal any farther, and, since Mr. Grant sought no more than the living of that parish, the Presbytery of Tain might, if they saw cause, collate him to it, but would never have it their power to fix a Pastoral relation between him and them."

Upon this, the Presbytery resolved that "they cannot proceed to the settlement of Mr. Grant in the parish of Nigg, as all the inhabitants thereof to a man are extremely adverse to his settlement amongst them; and, therefore the Presby-

of the "High flying or wild party,"—and latterly, with greater appropriateness, "the Evangelical party." The faithless majority, from their own boasted *moderation* in all matters of *Doctrinal faith* and *practical piety*, were distinguished as the "Moderate party;" and the

tery cannot have the remotest prospect that his settlement, should it take place, can reach any of the valuable and important ends of a Gospel ministry." The Commission rebuked them, and ordered them to proceed with the settlement, and accordingly, they met for that purpose in the Church of Nigg, when, in the terms of their own statement to next Assembly, "they could not find one single member of that congregation, or any one person having an interest in that parish, to witness or concur with Mr. Grant's settlement. The only person who appeared, came to tell them that the blood of the parish of Nigg would be required of them if they proceeded to settle a man to the walls of the Kirk, and then went off." This frightened them, and will it might. They delayed further procedure. For this they were censured by the Assembly, and peremptorily ordered to proceed on pain of instant deposition. Mr. Grant was then admitted minister of Nigg, and drew the stipend till the end of his life. The people, to whose excellent Christian character, the Presbytery bore the strongest testimony, never attended upon his ministry. A seceding place of worship was erected, and the late minister of the parish, in supporting the Veto Law a few years ago in the Assembly, declared that the injurious effects of that intrusion were felt in Nigg, and the surrounding district till the present day.

The next case we shall mention, is that of the parish of Shotts, and we shall describe it in the words of Seceders, who, naturally enough, were careful to record these violent settlements, and to hold them up in vindication of their continued secession from "the prevailing party in our judicatories." In the Narrative and Testimony adopted by the Anti-Burgher Synod in 1804, there is the following paragraph:—

"No consideration of the want of qualifications in the presentee, of personal danger to those appointed to ordain, or even of common decency, has prevented the Assembly from trampling the laws of Christ, and the rights of the people under foot. Of this, the settlement of Mr. Wells, as minister of the parish of Shotts, in the Presbytery of Hamilton, is an instance. Though he was in possession of the presentation several years before, such was the opposition of the people, that nothing could be done in the affair till the meeting of Assembly, 1764, when the presentation together with a pretended call, were sustained, and the Presbytery ordered to proceed. They having once and again prescribed Mr. Wells a course of trials, found him unqualified. Upon this, the Assembly appointed their Commission to receive his trials, who, having declared him qualified, ordered the Presbytery, without more ado, to proceed in the settlement. It is not to be wondered, at that the Presbytery scrupled to ordain one to the ministerial office, whom they had twice declared destitute of ministerial qualifications. They did not obey the order, and were therefore censured by the Assembly, 1767, and again ordered to proceed in the settlement against a fixed day. When the day arrived, it was found that the edict had not been served; and thus the matter was delayed till the meeting of Assembly, 1768. They, resolving to have it carried through during the time of their sitting, despatched a minister from Edinburgh to serve the edict in the Kirk of Shotts, on Sabbath the 22nd day of May, and appointed the ordination to take place on the 25th,—allowing only two free days between the service of the edict and the settlement. The minister finding no congregation at the Kirk of Shotts, affixed a copy of the edict to the Church-door, which was sustained by the Assembly as sufficient. The Presbytery having met for the ordination, could not get access to either the Church or Churchyard, nor to any private house in the neighbourhood; and the business was left undone. The Assembly, however, determined to proceed; and the King's Advocote having promised effectual assistance, they appointed the settlement to take place on the 2nd of June, and failing that day, on the 9th.

dreary years of their iron sway as the period of "Moderate ascendancy." It was a period which disgraced the feelings of civilized humanity as much as it outraged the cause of Christ, the sole and supreme Head of the Church. It was no longer a perfidious State arrayed against a faithful Church; but a perfidious Church-majority, marshalled against a faithful people. It was an age when the heavens were as brass, and the earth as iron, and no dew descending. The savour and unction

The abused people had by this time lost all temper, and by mere force prevented it on the first of these days. When the next arrived, a company of foot soldiers, with a troop of dragoons, were brought to the place, to force the settlement at the point of the bayonet. The design was notwithstanding still defeated, by the people's waylaying the members of Presbytery, and carrying them out of the road. But all other methods failing, the Presbytery did, on the 16th of August, in the session House of Hamilton, ordain Mr. Wells to be minister of the parish of Shotts:—Pages 69 and 70.

It is scarcely necessary to add, that a Seceding Church was erected. Such cases were not uncommon about that period. The result may be stated in the language of Sir Henry Moncrieff. "The people, disgusted with unsuccessful processes before the Assembly, relinquished the plan of their predecessors, and came seldom to the Assembly with appeals from the sentences of the inferior Courts appointing the settlement of presentees whom they resisted. But they began to do more quietly, or with less observation than formerly, what was not less unfriendly to the Establishment. In ordinary cases they now leave the Church-Courts to execute their sentences without opposition, and set themselves to rear a Seceding Meeting-house, which very frequently carries off a large portion of the inhabitants of the parish."

Another specimen may be furnished from a singularly unsuspicious source, THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW for August last. In a masterly article which triumphantly vindicates the Leaders and Founders of the Free Church of Scotland, we find the following passage:—"The morning of the 30th of May, 1751, saw the Churchyard of the parish of Torphichen thronged with rustics in their Sabbath clothes. With sorrow and indignation they were to witness the settlement of a pastor over them in the teeth of their continued and universal opposition. A cavalcade of merry clergymen came riding up headed by Mr. William Robertson, the minister of Gladsmuir. He was a man about thirty, with a countenance which he has transmitted to his descendant Lord Brougham—altogether an active, keen, bright look. The cavalcade of clergymen were flanked and surrounded by a troop of dragoons. As the troopers and parsons dashed among the people, tradition says, Captain Hamilton, of Westport, drew his sword, and shouted. "What! wont ye receive the gospel? I'll swap off the head o' any man that'll no (receive the gospel)." Thus did William Robertson proceed to bestow the spiritual office. Many years elapse. He is the chief of the Kirk. He has won the crown of history. Writing to Gibbon in his days of celebrity, he gives the clue to his conduct when the dragoon heading intruder at Torphichen. We find Principal Robertson the chief of the Kirk, congratulating the historian of the 'Decline and Fall' on his skilful management of superstition and bigotry in his chapters on Christianity. He thus gives us a glimpse of the moral theory of which the Torphichen intrusion was the application. The congratulation to Gibbon, and the dragoon ordination, were only the abstract and the concrete of the same thing." How distressing the reflection, that the only practical effect of the recent Bill of Lord Aberdeen has been, to place *increased power* in the hands of the *Moderates*,—who now, alas, from their overwhelming preponderance, truly constitute the *Erastianized Established Church of Scotland*,—for carrying out, according to their good pleasure, the obnoxious and anti-scriptural policy of their lineal predecessors of unenviable memory, during the latter half of last century! The only consolation is, that they have now got only a *very diminutive and servile fraction* of the general population, on which to operate.



of divine grace were gone; soundness in the faith and vital piety were at a discount; the bloodbought rights and liberties of God's people were treated as idle figments; and the supreme Headship and prerogatives of the Divine Redeemer, though still uncanceled from the Church's Standards and the Nation's Statute book, were practically regarded as the departed ghosts of once venerable phantasies. Instead of all this, there were substituted cold pretences of Academical learning, that froze the generous sympathies of the human heart—dry and barren essays, that unfolded the germs and budding flowers of subsequent heterodox opinions—and a wondrous and all-engrossing concern for the *finnesse* and *politesse* of fashionable manners, or smooth varnished hypocrisy. Or, to accommodate and apply the strong language of Milton, the Moderate rulers of that iron age were men of “unsolid and corrupt judgments”—“declaiming in rugged and miscellaneous gear blown together by the four winds”—“preferring the gay rankness of Apuleius or any modern fustianist,” to the sublime simplicity of Prophets and Apostles—“pestering their heads with the sapless dotages” of the schools—“feeding their flocks with windy speculations instead of sincere milk”—taking the way by their “sorcerous doctrine of formalities to transform their hearers out of Christian men into Judaizing beasts”—in their discourses, “affecting the comments and postils of friars and Jesuits, but scorning and slighting the Reformed writers; in so much that the better sort among them would confess it a rare matter to hear a true edifying sermon in any of their great Churches; and that such as were most hummed and applauded there, would scarcely be suffered a second hearing in a grave congregation of pious Christians, who would soon look through and through the lofty nakedness of your latinizing barbarian, and the finical goosery of your polite Sermon Actor.”

The dark sayings and doings of this period of gloom drew forth the “Ecclesiastical Characteristics, or Arcana of Church Policy, being an Humble Attempt to open the Mystery of Moderation,” by Dr. Wither-  
spoon—being one of the severest and most tremendous Satires of any age or nation. It is a Satire, which now cuts with the keenness of a razor's edge, and then crushes with the force of a sledge hammer. And both its cutting and crushing power is derived from its undeniable truthfulness. There are two ways in which we may judge of men's principles and practices. Given their determinate principles of action,—we may thence safely infer the leading features of their conduct. Or, given the leading features of their conduct,—we may thence safely infer their determinate principles of action. The latter is what has been accomplished, with consummate ability and skill, by the celebrated author of “the Ecclesiastical Characteristics.” With his well-known shrewdness and almost intuitive perspicacity he noted the distinguishing features in the practical conduct of the Moderates. The conduct so marked, he at once referred to the only principles of action which could satisfactorily account for it. These principles, again, he embodied in a series of maxims, or axioms,—the truth and reality of which were established and vindicated by logical reasonings and

illustrations derived from actual facts—while the whole was interspersed and enlivened by sallies of polished irony and grave sarcastic humour, such as have rarely proceeded from human wit. As the work is a rare one in this quarter of the world, we shall present a few of those maxims,—the truth of which it so amply verifies—the tendencies of which it so vividly illustrates—and the practical evils of which it so powerfully exposes.

Do you wish, then, to know how the Moderates treated that soundness of the faith which was once delivered unto the saints? Here is the maxim which alone explains their conduct:—"All Ecclesiastical persons, of whatever rank, whether Principals of Colleges, Professors of Divinity, Ministers, or even Probationers, that are suspected of heresy, are to be esteemed men of great genius, vast learning, and uncommon worth; and are by all means to be supported and protected." Do you wish to know how they treated those standards of their own Church, which, at ordination, they swore to uphold? Here is the only maxim that can explain their conduct:—"It is a necessary part of the character of a moderate man, never to speak of the Confession of faith, but with a sneer, to give sly hints, that he does not thoroughly believe it, and to make the word orthodoxy, a term of contempt and reproach." Do you wish to know their views of practical piety? The only maxim that can explain these, is this:—"A moderate man must endeavour, as much as he handsomely can, to put off any appearances of devotion, and avoid all unnecessary exercises of religious worship, whether public or private;" while his chief endeavour ought to be to acquire, instead, "as great a degree of politeness, in his carriage and behaviour, and to catch as much of the air and manner of a fine gentleman, as possibly he can." Do you wish to know their treatment of the all-important subject of practical morals? Here is the only maxim that can explain their conduct:—"When any man is charged with loose practices, or tendencies to immorality, he is to be screened and protected as much as possible; especially if the faults laid to his charge, be, as they are incomparably well termed, in a sermon, preached by a hopeful youth, that made some noise lately, *good humoured vices*." Do you wish to know their special signs and marks of a talent for preaching—or the distinguishing qualities of a good preacher? Here is the only maxim which can exhibit these:—1st. "His subjects must be confined to social duties. 2d. He must recommend them only from rational considerations, viz. the beauty and comely proportions of virtue, and its advantages in the present life, without any regard to a future state of more extended self-interest. 3d. His authorities must be drawn from heathen-writers, *none*, or as few as possible, from Scripture. 4th. He must be very unacceptable to the common people." Do you wish to know their principles in reference to the qualifications, the fitness, and the choice of Pastors? The only maxim which can embody these, is the following:—"In Church-settlements, which are the principal causes that come before ministers for judgment, the only thing to be regarded is, who the Patron and the great and noble heritors are for; the inclinations of the common people

are to be utterly despised." Again, "while a settlement is carrying on, the candidate against whom there is a strong opposition from the people, must be looked upon, and everywhere declared to be, a person of great worth and remarkable abilities; provided always, that if ever the same person, after he is settled, be at pains, and succeed in gaining the people's affections, he shall then fall as much below the ordinary standard in his character, as before he was raised above it." Do you wish to know their estimate and treatment of the pious and godly minority opposed to them? The only maxim that can adequately represent these, runs thus:—"The character which moderate men give their adversaries, of the orthodox party, must always be that of knaves or fools; and, as occasion serves, the same person (if it will pass) may be represented as a *knave* at one time, and as a *fool* at another." Do you wish, on the other hand, to know their estimate and treatment of the ungodly and profane? Here is the maxim which sets forth these:—"As to the world in general, a moderate man is to have great charity for Atheists and Deists in principle, and for persons that are loose and vicious in their practice: but none at all for those that have a high profession of religion, and a great pretence to strictness in their walk and conversation."

When principles and maxims like these were gaining a practical ascendancy in Church Counsels and Courts, is it to be wondered at that, in 1784, when they reached their very zenith, the Annual Protest against the Patronage Act was dropped? Need it excite surprise that—when in every case, effect was given to presentations, and Ministers were repeatedly thrust into parishes amid riot, uproar, and bloodshed, at the point of the bayonet,—the faithful were driven in crowds from the pale of a degraded Establishment, and compelled to form themselves into Relief and Secession Churches? But, it may well be noted with astonishment, as an ineffaceable memorial of the felt strength and stability of the Church's scriptural and statutory principles, that, even at the darkest hour of this "long night of defection and unavailing struggle in behalf of the people's Christian rights," the call of the people was once more formally re-declared\* to be "an essential pre-requisite to the formation of the pastoral relationship, according to the principles of the Church of Scotland." It need scarcely, however, be added, that, notwithstanding this formal re-declaration of a principle which never was erased from the Statute book, or dropped from the actual practice of the Church, it was in

\* This declaration of the Assembly of 1784, was as follows:—"Upon a motion that the resolution of Assembly respecting the Moderation of calls, should, for the satisfaction of all concerned, be converted into a declaratory Act, and printed amongst the Acts of Assembly, the General Assembly agreed thereto without a vote; and, in terms of said resolution, did, and hereby do declare, that the Moderation of a call, in the settlement of Ministers, is agreeable to the immemorial and constitutional practice of this Church, and ought to be continued."

reality reduced to an unmeaning form or solemn farce—though even as a form or a farce, it continued to lift up an unmistakeable testimony in favour of constitutional law, and the primitive Polity of the Church.

We cannot close this notice of the period of our Church's greatest eclipse, when so "disastrous a twilight" was shed over a whole nation, without remarking on the utter practical worthlessness of mere Creeds however sound, or mere Polity and form however scriptural, without the animating actual recognition of the supremacy of the Great Head, and the inspiring actual presence and life-giving energy of his Holy Spirit. In those dark and evil days of Moderate despotism, when the Supreme Headship of the Divine Redeemer was treated practically as nothing better, or more real, than a mythological artifice of Homeric song ;—and when, as a necessary result, the peculiarities of the gospel were despised as nauseous, and devotion scorned as contemptible ; the flock of immortal spirits estimated as nothing, and the golden fleece as every thing ; the means of grace at home increasingly circumscribed, and missions to the heathen abroad openly denounced as the very climax of raving fanaticism\* ;—is it not memorable, that, even then,

\* In May, 1796, the subject of Missions was regularly and constitutionally brought before the General Assembly, by overtures from the Provincial Synods of Fife and Moray. These overtures were, as follows :—"The *Synod of Fife* humbly overture the ensuing General Assembly of this Church, that the Assembly may consider of the most effectual methods, by which the Church of Scotland may contribute to the diffusion of the gospel over the world." Again, "It is humbly overtured" (by the *Synod of Moray*) "to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, that, in respect a very laudable zeal for sending the gospel to Heathen countries has appeared both in Scotland and England, the Assembly should encourage this spirit and promote this most important and desirable object, by appointing a general collection over the Church, or adopting whatever other method may appear to them most effectual."

These overtures, which, one would suppose, might be regarded as of a very humble and harmless description, occasioned a long and vigorous debate. The evangelical party, headed by the venerable Dr. John Erskine, nobly defended the cause of Missions to the Heathen—triumphantly vindicated the scriptural principles on which it was based—and powerfully enforced the obligation under which the Christian Church lay to promote it. But, being still in a *minority*, they proposed no more than "That a Committee be appointed by the Assembly, to inquire into, and deliberate upon, the overtures from the Synods of Fife and Moray ; and to report the result of such enquiry, and deliberation, to next Assembly."

If the overtures themselves were harmless, one would suppose that *such* a motion was at least equally so. But not so thought the Moderates. By them a counter-motion was made to, effect, "*That the overtures from the Synods of Fife and Moray be IMMEDIATELY DISMISSED,*" which, of course, was carried by a great majority.

Never was the genuine essence or quintessence of Moderatism more clearly brought out and exhibited than on the present occasion. Some of the Speakers vaguely and indefinitely admitted, that there were scripture Prophecies which pointed to the *ultimate* propagation of the Christian faith—that it was even legitimate for such as were so disposed, to *pray* for the fulfilment of such Prophecies— but that, at present, to attempt to *do* any thing towards such consummation, was, to say the least, "highly inexpedient." Others, scouting such con-

every article of the subscribed Confession of faith, every principle of Discipline, every form of Polity, every registered Act in the National Statute book was, without addition, subtraction, or modification of any kind, exactly the same as when lately, under the reign of Evangelical ascendancy, the Supreme Headship of the Redeemer was so gloriously vindicated, the Christian flock re-invested with a large share of its long lost rights and liberties, the means of salvation extended indefinitely at home, and fresh conquests achieved for the everlasting gospel abroad? In the former, as in the latter case, all things *external*, relating to Standards and Creeds, Books of Discipline and Polity, were precisely identical. But, oh, how different the results! Whence, then, it may be asked, a difference so vast and so momentous? Is it not, that in the former, there was an extinction, and in the latter, a re-infusion of spiritual life? Under the gloomy and iron sway of Moderatism, the Church was not merely stereotyped;—it was literally fossilized—yea, petrified! It bore upon its rueful visage not merely the image but the reality of stagnation and death. Where shall we cast about for any adequate similitude to represent the saddening phenomenon? Shall we go to the catacombs of nature—the wonders

cessions altogether, saw in the overtures, the germinating seeds of danger and alarm, sedition and treason. “Moderator, I rise, Sir,” commenced one of the Moderate Orators, “impressed with a sense of the *alarming and dangerous tendency of the measures proposed in the overtures on your table; overtures which I cannot too strongly oppose, and which, I trust, all the loyal and well-affected members will be unanimous in opposing.*” And, after drawing an alarming picture of his own imaginary fears, the Orator concludes:—“And, as to these *Missionary Societies*, I do aver that since it is to be apprehended that their *funds may be, in time, nay, certainly will be turned against the constitution; (1)* so it is the *bounden duty* of this House to give the overtures recommending them our *most serious disapprobation, and our immediate, most decisive opposition.*” Others, rising still higher into the regions of *Philosophy*, rationalized in a style that might suit a German atmosphere. “I cannot,” said another of the Moderate Orators, “otherwise consider the *enthusiasm* on this subject, than as the effect of *sanguine and illusive views, the more dangerous, because the object is so plausible.* To spread abroad the knowledge of the Gospel among *barbarous and Heathen nations, seems to me highly preposterous*, in as far as it anticipates, *nay as it even reverses, the order of nature.* Men must be *polished and refined* in their manners, *before they can be properly enlightened by religious truths.* *Philosophy and learning must, in the nature of things, take the precedence.* Indeed it should seem hardly less absurd to make revelation precede civilization in the order of time, than to pretend to unfold to a child the *Principia* of Newton, ere he is made at all acquainted with the letters in the alphabet. These ideas seem to me alike founded in error, and therefore I must consider them both as *equally romantic and visionary.*” “Better far were it to leave our fellow creatures to the protection of the common Father of mankind, and to such glimmerings as the lights he vouchsafes them by nature afford, than to tell them what they cannot at all comprehend;—what they will not practise.” I deprecate the idea of applying for a new subscription, upon a *scheme so extraordinary and romantic.*” “I am obliged heartily to oppose the motion for a Committee, &c. &c.”

If such exposé of genuine Moderate sentiments be regarded as embodying what is true and sound, how can one help exclaiming,—“Alas alas! how strangely mistaken our Blessed Lord and His Inspired Apostles must have been!”

of which have been revealed by the torch of Geological Science? Behold that singular member of a subterranean forest—the surviving relic of a former epoch! *There*, are all the veritable signs of its genealogy and true character—an entire mechanism for the performance of the varied functions of organic life—the cellular tissue, with its elongated cells or tubes for the reception of juices, studded also with peculiar spots or glands—and the woody fibre, with its concentric layers and radiated structure. Every thing is there, not only to distinguish and mark out the substance, as a product of the vegetable world, but the genus, yea, and the very species too. But, alas, there is no motion—no circulation of fluids—no life there!—all has been petrified, or turned into stone!

Behold, again, that singular member of a subterranean menagerie—the wondrous monument of an age long gone by—the giant mammoth of the frozen sands of Lena! There, too, are all the veritable signs of its genealogy and true character—a perfect organization, with every member entire, not only in form but also in substance—with bones and flesh, skin and hair, brain and eyes, tusks and teeth, and every other organ, external and internal, for the discharge of the varied functions of animal life. But, alas, there is no motion—no pulsation—no process of assimilation—no life, there!—all has been for ages congealed, or turned into the chilly stiffness of an icy rock!

Or, shall we turn to the catacombs of human art—the wonders of which have been disclosed by the researches of a fond and doating antiquarianism. Behold, there, the perfect form—the perfect reality—of all that is corporeal and unspiritual in man. There, behold, securely sheltered for many an age,—alike from the gnawings of the devouring worm, and the scorchings of a tropical heat,—the mortal remains of what once might have been the living forms of ancient royalty—as if endowed with immortality of being! To adopt and accommodate the somewhat embellished but substantially accurate description of a late poetical countryman:—

Each in his own alcove, and on his throne,  
The Kings of old were seated; in his hand  
Each held the sceptre of command,  
So well had the embalmers done their part  
With spice and precious unguents, to imbue  
The perfect corpse, that each had still the hue  
Of living man;  
The robes of royalty which once they wore  
Long since had mouldered off and left them bare:  
Naked upon their thrones behold them there,  
Statues of actual flesh,—a fearful sight!  
Their large and rayless eyes,  
Glaz'd, fix'd, and meaningless,—yet, open wide,  
Their ghastly balls belied  
The mockery of life in all beside.

But what poor and faint similitudes do the strangest realities of the catacombs, whether of the world of nature or of art, supply of the still

stranger realities, which the faithful historian must resuscitate from the catacombs of the world of spirit! And, sure, beyond all debate, the dismal years of the latter half of last century—years of worse than sepulchral gloom, under the withering frown of moderate ascendancy,—must ever be accounted as the age of the catacombs in the History of the Church of Scotland. All things were there, as before and after—A Scriptural Constitution and Polity were there, unaltered;—A Scriptural Creed, and Confession, and Directory of worship were there, uncanceled;—A Scriptural Government, and Order, and Discipline were there, unchanged;—Scriptural Ordinances and Sacraments were there, unvaried;—Scriptural forms and processes, for judging of the qualifications and conduct of ministers and members, were there, unmodified:—all things were there, essential to the vigorous discharge of the varied functions of a fully organized Spiritual Body. But, alas, alas, there was no motion—no breath—no pulsation—no sign or symptom of spiritual life, there!—all, all had been metamorphosed into stone, or congealed into ice, or embalmed and bandaged into the lifeless rigidity of a ghastly Ecclesiastical mummyhood!

The shepherds, in order to gratify the great and the mighty of this world, instead of watching over and hedging round their flocks, gave them up as a helpless prey to the cruel spoiler. The rights and liberties of the people, instead of being sacredly guarded and defended, were allowed to be contemptuously trodden in the dust. But He, who now sitteth in the heavens, and who graciously rewards the giving even of a cup of cold water to a disciple, in the name of a disciple, felt aggrieved and dishonoured by this infraction of the privileges, which he had freely conferred on the subjects of his own kingdom of grace. The Great Head was wounded, through the wound so deeply inflicted on the members of his Body. His presence was, therefore, gradually withdrawn, and the shining of his gracious countenance. And the withdrawal of his presence was like the removal of the Sun from that world of beauty, which is not gladdened merely, but almost created by his beams. Memorable warning to all the Churches of the earth—and all coming generations—not to tamper with the sole and Supreme Headship of the Divine Redeemer—either abstractly, as a glorious doctrine and revealed article of faith, or practically, in any of its minutest applications! The History of the world at large, and of Scotland in particular, amply proves that the vigorous maintenance of it, has ever been a cause and a consequence of a flourishing Church—while the neglect of it has as invariably proved a cause and a consequence of a degenerating Church. Only let the Church duly honour her great and Supreme Head, and He will duly honour her. But let her prove faithless to Him, and she shall be lightly esteemed. Let her neglect Him—or forget Him—or practically disown Him, as her great Head and King;—let her, from worldly considerations of profit, or pleasure, or policy, suffer his honour to be tarnished and his glory to be eclipsed;—she may still contrive to retain outward decencies of *form*, but the spirit is fled—the life is extinct,—for the glory of the Lord hath departed from her, is gone hence.

Then, no more awakenings—no more conversions. No vehement cryings out, what must we do to be saved? No kindlings of spirit—no impetuous longings—no insatiable thirstings, and pantings, and hungerings after righteousness. No souls regenerated; no saints edified; no sinners saved. Then, too, no outward spread—no new extension—no fresh conquests in the dominion of sense and the empire of sin, where Satan's dwellings chiefly be. For, if no light be enjoyed, how can it be imparted? If no life be possessed, how can it be communicated? Within, all is the lank and famished leanness of a scorching drought. Without, all is the naked sterility of a waste howling desert. But, let the Church, nobly casting away from her all views of carnal honour, profit, and renown, ever turn, with steadfast and unvarying faithfulness, to her Great Head, even as the moon, her own prophetic emblem, ever turneth towards the sun, the divinely chosen symbol of her Lord, and then shall her face truly shine, and the pulse of life in her be mightily quickened. Then, shall her righteousness go forth as brightness; and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. Then, shall a numerous offspring be born unto her, and spread and multiply over all the earth—awakened, as by a divine impulse—vivified, as by the breath of a divine spirit—inflamed, as by seraphic ardour—and illumined, as with a blaze of celestial light. Then,—then—amid the songs of rejoicing lands, will be illustriously verified the heavenly strain, which, ere while in vision, kindled into fire the heart of Judah's hallowed seer:—"Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. And the gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising."

---



## II.—VIOLENT SETTLEMENTS DURING THE REIGN OF MODERATISM.

[It may interest some of our readers, and satisfy others, it may tend to edify the few, and inform the many, if we give a specimen of that intrusionism concerning which so much has been said and written of late. Far worse illustrations of the reign of Moderatism, than that now to be presented, might be adduced; we give this only as a specimen of what is meant by intruding a Pastor on a Christian congregation—not of the actual extent to which such intrusion may, in some cases, have reached. Alas, there are some of us who have from our childhood been eye-witnesses of the spiritually-destructive and eternally-ruinous system of forcing ungodly and worldly Pastors upon reclining and resisting parishes. The Lord God only can estimate the amount of evil which this abuse (not element) of an Established Church has produced.]—ED. F. C. M.

### TEXT.

[The Moderate party] “viewed the existing law, which imposed NO CHECK UPON THE ABSOLUTE CHOICE OF THE PATRON, except the Presbytery’s judgment (after due trial and examination) upon the qualifications and fitness of his presentee, as not only clearly expressed and definitively settled in the statutes, but also as embodying a system CONSISTENT WITH TRUE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, AND LIKELY TO BE PRODUCTIVE OF PERMANENTLY BENEFICIAL EFFECTS. The memorialists and their constituents are the existing representatives of this last-mentioned party in the Church; and they are proud to say, that the anticipations of their forefathers have been realized to the fullest extent.”—(*Recent Memorial of the Moderates, signed by Dr. Cook.*)

### COMMENTARY.

#### PARISH OF FENWICK.

Fenwick is a country parish near Kilmarnock, and in the Presbytery of Irvine. The road from Glasgow to Kilmarnock passes close by the church. Indeed this parish was divided from Kilmarnock, of which it originally formed a part, only during the stirring period of the Second Reformation, and the celebrated William Guthrie, author of the “*Trial of the Saving Interest*,” was ordained its first minister, on November 7, 1644. So very popular was he as a preacher at Fenwick, that crowds flocked from all parts of Scotland to hear him; and some built houses in the parish merely to enjoy the benefit of his ministry. When Guthrie was ejected during the persecution of Charles II. and at the instigation of Archbishop Burnet, historians inform us, that he “had some difficulty in getting the affection of the people to him so far moderated as to keep them from violent proceedings against the party who came to depose him. They would actually have prevented the church from being declared vacant, and were ready to have resisted even unto blood, striving against sin, had they been permitted. After the Revolution 1690, a series of admirable men were ministers of Fenwick, the last of whom, Mr. James Halket, an extremely popular preacher, and a man much beloved, died suddenly whilst assisting at the communion in Glasgow about the middle of April 1779. This led to one of those atrocious cases of intrusion then so common, forming part of “the system, consistent with true religious liberty, likely to be productive of permanently beneficial effects,” to which the present minority have formally served themselves heirs, and which they are labouring, as the tools of the Court of Session,

to restore. We shall narrate the case from materials furnished by the celebrated John Howie of Lochgoin, himself a native of Fenwick, and from the records of the Presbytery of Irvine.

After Mr. Halket's death, "all the members of Session (consisting of nine) met, and after exhorting one another to be much in prayer to God that He would send them another pastor in his room," they appointed special prayer meetings for that end. They also applied to the "Honourable Patrick Boyle," the uncle and one of the tutors of the Earl of Glasgow (then a minor), for a list of candidates, as had been given on all previous occasions. He gave them some reason to think that this request would be granted, but soon after they learnt with astonishment and sorrow that Mr. Reid, minister of a chapel in Greenock, who had lived for some time near Fenwick, and was a person whom they all disliked, had received and accepted the presentation. They immediately wrote to Mr. Reid on the subject, setting forth, "that the Word of God doth allow a great interest to all judicious Christians in the choice of their pastors, and that it is their unquestionable right and privilege to have a judgment of discretion concerning those pastors to whom they are bound to commit the guiding and edification of their immortal souls, and *no patron, nor heritor, nor any body of men whatsoever, can justly deprive them of that right and privilege which God allows them.*" To this letter they received a jesuitical answer, to the effect that "such a remonstrance *would have been addressed with greater propriety to the Legislature of the nation,*" &c. The Session, however, pressed home their argument by urging "that the legislative power respecting the present affair *resides entirely with yourself,* if we mistake not, as no other person could compel you to accept the presentation;" but Mr. Reid put a bold face on the matter, declared that all who opposed him were "busy bodies," and that he would not cease to pray, that "in spite of all the devices of the devil and his emissaries," God would turn the *hearts of the people to him.* Meantime he was determined to secure the temporalities, and was so impious as to compare himself to our blessed Saviour, and this conscientious opposition made by a pious people against his selfish project, to that experienced by "the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, who was *not called, but despised and rejected by the people!*" In a word, his whole conduct was so heartless and profane, that when he came to preach at Fenwick before the moderation of the call, *there was not one human being present in the church but the precentor* (the beadle, as will be seen, was at that time a staunch Non-Intrusionist), and when the call was moderated, *not one heritor, elder, or inhabitant of the parish, signed it;* it was only signed by the Earl of Glasgow's factor in name of his Lordship's tutors; in other words, the patron approved of his own presentation, and called his own presentee. The entire people of the parish were openly opposed to the presentee. One or two *non-resident* heritors were afterwards induced to write letters of concurrence, and the case came before the Assembly 1780, when an heritor, an elder, and a head of a family, as representing the whole parish of Fenwick, addressed the House against the settlement, "to good purpose," but, of course, the inexorable Assembly "sustained the *concurrence!* with the patron and presentee, and appointed the Presbytery of Irvine to proceed to forwards the settlement of the presentee *with all convenient speed, according to the rules of the Church!*" This sentence would undoubtedly have been executed, if necessary, at the point of the bayonet, had Mr. Reid not *resigned his presentation*, August 13, 1780, probably scared by the unanimous and steadfast opposition of the whole parish.

Immediately after this a new presentation was issued by the representatives of the patron "in favour of Mr. William Boyd, preacher of the gospel, to be minister" at Fenwick. This presentation was given in to the Presby-

tery of Irvine on the 3d of October 1780, and the 23d of November was appointed as the day on which his call was to be moderated. Mr. Boyd being a stranger, the people went to hear him preach on the two Sabbaths before his call was moderated, anxious, if possible, to concur with his settlement. but "to their inexpressible sorrow, they had the mortification to find" that he was a feeble, cold, and inefficient preacher, who "read" his "*very short*" sermons, and that, too, in such a low and slovenly style, that he could not be heard by the people. They were, therefore opposed to his settlement to a man. The minute of Presbytery at moderating in the call is a curiosity in its way.

"Fenwick Kirk, November 23d, 1780. Sederunt,—*Mr. Brisbane, Moderator, and Mr. Tod!* and having constituted by prayer, they proceeded to moderate in a call to Mr. Boyd; and having asked if Mr. Lawrie had made intimation of said moderation according to the appointment of the Presbytery, it was reported that he had. It was then asked, if there were any letters from the non-residing heritors,—NONE WERE PRODUCED, NEITHER DID ANY COME FORWARD TO SIGN THE CALL OR PAPER OF CONCURRENCE.—Closed with prayer.

(Signed) "THOMAS BRISBANE, *Moderator.*

Accordingly, when the call was returned to the Presbytery, it was "FOUND SIGNED BY NO PERSON WHATEVER;" and a "large compareance from the parish of Fenwick," headed by James Cuthbertson, one of the elders, flocked into the Presbytery Hall, expressing their unanimous and conscientious opposition to the presentee, and presenting "two papers" of remonstrance against his settlement. The first of the papers was a minute of a meeting of "heritors, elders, and most of the heads of families," at Fenwick Kirk, at which they appointed a large deputation to attend the Presbytery," and the meeting unanimously agreed to *empower the above persons to REJECT Mr. William Boyd as minister of this parish,*" and they declare that it "is to be understood as if THE WHOLE PARISH had signed this mandate." The second paper was a very earnest and affecting petition, in which they implore the Presbytery not to proceed to Mr. Boyd's settlement, as he "can be of no benefit apparently in this parish." They go on to say, "We, your petitioners, flatter ourselves that you would not love to see the parish of Fenwick divided and separated from the present Establishment by a violent settlement of a minister amongst us; and we, your humble petitioners, crave that you, the members of the Presbytery, would interpose with the patron for us, that he, or they, would condescend so far as to have an agreeable settlement of a pastor in this parish, by having some correspondence with the people of Fenwick anent the choosing of a minister for this parish; and if it is the will of Almighty God, we wish it to be soon settled with a pastor according to His own heart, because we have no stated ordinances in this place." They concluded by praying, "That God may, in His infinite wisdom, direct you, the members of Presbytery, and us, and all concerned in this affair, in such a way that it may turn out to the glory of God and the welfare of the Church of Christ in general, and to the parish of Fenwick in particular." At the same Presbytery, one or two *non-resident* heritors, including the well-known Dr. Thomas McKnight of Edinburgh, again gave in letters of concurrence with the new presentee, and the case was referred for advice to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr. When the question came before the Synod, a Moderate minister said, addressing the representatives of the people of Fenwick, "Desert from the Church of Scotland, and get a minister of your own, in God's name, and pay him." Another said, "He believed these two (Mr. Reid and Mr. Boyd) to be the best or most famous ministers in the Church of Scotland, and, if he were to die just now, he could proceed to settle the later at Fenwick." An old and foolish trick this of Moderatism

not quite given up, to attempt to overbear the reason of the people by stout, and confident, although grossly uncandid, assertions. The case was so strong, however, that the Synod by a majority resolved to set aside the presentation, and appointed the Presbytery of Irvine "to inform the Right Honourable patron of Fenwick of this step of the Synod, and to beg of him to present *de novo*;" but the Assembly 1781 "reversed the sentence of the Synod"—"sustained the concurrence with Mr. Poyd the presentee, and appointed the Presbytery of Irvine to proceed towards the settlement of Mr. Boyd with all convenient speed, according to the rules of the Church." Dr. Johnston of Leith, and several other excellent men, dissented from this judgment, and entered strong reasons of dissent on the records of the Assembly. The Presbytery, in great difficulty how to proceed, as the opposition was as strong and unanimous as ever, resolved to *delay* the settlement; and meantime, by way of softening the hostility, they appointed Mr. Boyd "to preach at Fenwick as often as he conveniently can." But the people sent him a vigorous letter on the subject, containing a list of pointed questions, one or two of which will give an idea of the whole. "*Query.* Is this manner of proceeding of yours, when the people have no desire for you, any way agreeable to the rules laid down in the Word of God? Do you think this way of being pastor in a parish by a patron does not rob Christ of his prerogative, He being the great Lawgiver, Head, and King of his Church? Does it not become a people to be anxiously concerned about the choice of a pastor that, by the blessing of God, may be the happy instrument of winning souls to Christ? Is the reading of or preaching on a paper from a pulpit agreeable to apostolic rule? Do you think that this procedure does not offend some of these His little ones, and do you not observe the woe pronounced?" It does not appear that any answer was given to this interesting document. When Mr. Boyd went to Fenwick to preach, according to the advice of the Presbytery, he gives the following singular account of the reception he met with. "He came to Fenwick on the Saturday preceding, with an intention to preach next day. When Sabbath came he was informed that the church doors were put into such a condition that by them he could have no access to the church, and that as no person convened to hear sermon, he then went to Stewarton to attend upon public worship there." A person who had come with him to Fenwick from Kilbarchan gives the following additional particulars: "That the beadle was desired on the Saturday evening to ring the kirk-bell as a signal that the parish was to have sermon to-morrow; that this he refused to do; that also on the Sabbath he refused to ring the bell;" and that when this person and Mr. Boyd were on their way to Stewarton, "they were followed for about a quarter of a mile by a number of boys and some girls crying out, 'Thief and robber.'" (John x. 1.) This was certainly not a very promising beginning of the plan of conciliation, and Mr. Boyd seems to have abandoned afterwards all attempts to obtain the situation otherwise than by civil and ecclesiastical force. He struck like a leech to his presentation, and the Presbytery, after a long struggle with the people, in which the latter urged a variety of strong and cogent objections to the settlement, all to no purpose, resolved again to refer the matter to the Assembly. This reference was accompanied by a "memorial," which is a very curious, cunning, and heartless document, proceeding as it did from men who were bound to watch over the souls of all those within their bounds, "as those that must give an account." They extol Mr. Boyd as "a young man of distinguished abilities and worth," (a second Horsley?) and they go on to say,—

"They are extremely sorry that the prospect of success in the parish of Fenwick so ill corresponds with his merit. Had that parish paid any regard to the Presbytery's opinion, frequently and unanimously declared, both with respect to Mr. Boyd and the

former presentee, the Assembly would not have been troubled with either of the causes. The Presbytery, however, cannot charge themselves with taking any steps that had the smallest tendency unnecessarily to procrastinate the settlement. On the other hand, they have employed every lenient method which prudence and a regard to the rules of the Church could suggest, in order to bring it about. But all their endeavours this way have hitherto proved fruitless. *The opposition to the presentee from the parish of Fenwick is now as strong as ever, and in such a situation the Presbytery think it incumbent upon them to apply to the venerable Assembly for the interposition of their wisdom in a matter so truly difficult; and if the venerable Assembly shall think proper to appoint Mr Boyd's ordination, they would humbly petition them TO ORDAIN HIM THEMSELVES! which they can easily do by a small Committee of their own number appointed for that purpose, by laying on of hands and prayer.* The Presbytery would not have taken the liberty of having suggested this much, but from a conviction that it will be highly expedient in the present instance, for the peace of this corner of the country, for the comfort of Mr. Boyd himself, and even the benefit of the parish of Fenwick! as by this means they will be freed from all temptations to resist lawful authority." [The Assembly's power was quite lawful when on the side of intrusion.] "Their conviction of the propriety of this measure is founded upon their knowledge of the temper of that parish, as well as the best knowledge of the temper and situation of their own people, whose minds are in danger of being alienated from the Establishment by Relief Houses and Seceding meetings lately erected in their bounds. When a sentence of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court which clashes with the prejudices of the people must be carried into execution, the wisdom of that Court will see that it is best executed in a quiet and easy, and in a soft and inoffensive manner, to avoid any thing that may disappoint the execution of it, or may at least raise a bad spirit! the effects of which may be felt and remembered many years after the occasion of it would otherwise have been forgotten. The Assembly have now this in their own power; they know that the proposed mode of ordination HAS NOTHING IN IT CONTRARY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH! Precedents might be mentioned where it has already been followed with advantage, particularly in the ordination of the Rev. Dr. Dick to be minister of Lanark, by the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, IN THE CITY OF GLASGOW [i. e. TWENTY MILES from his church.] (See Morren's Annals, vol. i. p. 71, 172.) In the present case, the Presbytery have the fullest conviction that, by such a step alone can the settlement be carried into execution with the least prejudice to the interests of religion and edification of the people under their charge!"

Before proceeding to state the issue of this singular reference, if the matter were not too serious, we would ask how it would do to suggest this as an ingenious shift for our modern Intrusionists, sorely beset with difficulties in these trying times? Military and Justiciary trials are both *very costly*, and not very efficient, and the country is poor. Besides, ordaining intruders on the spot leads to retreats through turnip fields, body guards of police officers instead of cordial welcomes, loss of temper, swearing on the part of Intrusionist elders, and other evils and inconveniences. Why not ordain the men at once in the outer Parliament House? Why not let the Judges preach and preside on all such occasions, since all power, ecclesiastical as well as civil, is found to be centred in them? They might appoint a fixed day, and ordain a batch at once. More dignified to do it themselves than set up and empower suspended ministers to do their work. We shall promise Lord Gillies a good audience when his sermon is announced at moderating in the call; and the men may quietly, after the work is over, without trouble or expense to the country, find their way to their several spheres of action as "stipend-lifters," as they best may. Let their Lordships think of this hint, now that the national finances are at such a low ebb, and that the resistance of the people is again becoming so inconvenient and troublesome.

But to proceed: The Assembly were not disposed to take the kind hint of the Presbytery, probably dreading the amount of work that might thus accumulate on their hands; and they "enjoined the Presbytery of Irvine to proceed to the settlement of Mr. Boyd, the presentee, according to the rules of the Church, on or before the 25th day of June next (1782), and require all the members of Presbytery to attend at the settlement."

In obedience to this injunction, the Presbytery appointed "that Mr.

William Boyd shall be ordained by them minister of Fenwick, at a MEETING OF PRESBYTERY TO BE HELD AT IRVINE FOR THAT END." Accordingly, he was ordained "in the TOLBOOTH HOUSE" AT IRVINE, *ten or twelve miles* from his church, "by *prayer*, and by laying on of the hands of the Presbytery," on the 25th of June 1782. It is stated that they had still so much regard for decency left, as actually to *alter the ordination questions* on the occasion, and instead of asking Mr. Boyd if he accepted of and closed with "this *call*," they asked him if he accepted of this "PRESENTATION" They preached *no sermon*, nor had they any other ceremony on this singular occasion, except a short address to Mr. Boyd. The parish of Fenwick had struggled for three years against two hireling preachers and a tyrannical Church. During the latter part of the struggle there was no sermon in Fenwick Church for *thirty-seven successive Sabbaths*. The people, to use the striking language of the venerable Howie, went "from one judicatory to another in order to obtain their just desires, and all without success; for to their mortification they were made to behold, that *in the place of judgment wickedness was there*. On the Sabbath following his ordination Mr. Boyd made his way to the church, and when he found the doors locked, he, along with his attendants, broke in by the "church window," but "*not one adult person in the parish attended except the beadle!*" The whole people, the children of Guthrie's flock, were *driven from the Establishment*,—they built a meeting-house for themselves, and sought the gospel where it was to be found.

Shall we ask again if such doings were in accordance with the spirit of Christianity? These were the Marnochs and Culsalmonds of other days, which so many are at present thirsting again to restore, with all their desolating consequences, in the midst of us.

And yet Dr. Muir sees, in the suspension of such proceedings, and in an attempt to sweep away the odious law in which they originated, "*just a forward step in the great march, the end of which would be in Scotland the dissemination of infidelity and misrule, and consequently of ruin!*" and Mr. James Grant declares that a Church which has now "*come to its right mind*," and which refuses to perpetrate such proceedings, or allow them to be perpetrated by any ministers in her communion, is led "*by a handful of well-meaning, it may be, but misguided and intolerant! men, who have obtained an accidental and temporary sway amongst us*," but who, he hopes, "*will soon be put to silence*, and the *peace and order* of that Church be restored, which in THEIR HANDS THREATENS TO BECOME A BYEWORD AND NUISANCE IN THE LAND! !" We leave the Christian people to judge.—*Church Defence Tract.* [The italics are from the original.]

### III.—THE DUKE OF SUTHERLAND.

*[The article subjoined is worthy of a place more permanent than the ephemeral columns of a newspaper—even although it be a newspaper of no ordinary talent. The writer is intimately acquainted with his subject—and his victim richly deserves the chastisement he so heavily receives. The unchristian atrocities, formerly perpetrated in the devoted county of Sutherland, for the improvement of the land, are here placed in natural and significant juxtaposition, with the spirit of intolerance and persecution now manifested by the same aristocratic family, and on the same soil, for the maintenance of the Established Church—ESTABLISHED, alas! now, in the unresisting solitude of a popular vacancy, so far as regards the patrimony of Sutherland's Duke.]*

*(Extracted from the "Witness" Journal.)*

THE DUKE OF SUTHERLAND TO THE RIGHT HON. FOX MAULE.

*London, June 6th, 1843.*

My Dear Sir, Lord Morpeth has communicated to me your letter on the expediency of granting sites for chapels for Seceders from the Church of Scotland.

I fully agree with you in the principles you express of toleration in general, and in respect for the religious feelings of the people of Scotland, and I must always regret when it may not be in my power to meet their wishes in furthering measures which may seem to them essential, and in accordance with their zealous piety and devotion.

Though not a Presbyterian, I have always been accustomed to consider the Church of Scotland entitled to the respect and the attentive care of all who have at heart the welfare of the people, to whose moral and religious character that Church has been a faithful support—and I regret deeply that an interruption has been occasioned by the late unfortunate spirit of agitation, which must, for some time, have a very injurious effect on the Church, as to both ministers and congregations.

I am placed in a very difficult position, being loyally engaged to endeavour to maintain an Establishment which I sincerely respect, and being naturally disposed, as far as I can, to consult the feelings of the people, even when I consider them to have been misled and mistaken. Above all I dislike religious persecution, and I trust that I shall always be an opposer of measures tending to it, or to intolerance. I cannot but think, however, that such are at present directed against the Establishment, and that if, as a proprietor, I were to grant sites for building for the purpose of opposing the ministration, to do which, a desperate spirit has been evinced, I should not only acquiesce in, but even sanction and encourage it, and this I should consider very wrong.

This consideration applies more particularly to this present time of agitation and excitement, but local circumstances may justify, in some parts of the country, what in others would be objectionable. In populous, widely spread parishes, at convenient distances from the parish church, where additional places of worship are much required, the resources offered by those who follow respected ministers may be applied, but whatever may be the case in regard to this farther south, I doubt that any unprejudiced person

would consider the position, occasions, and circumstances, of our Highland parishes as generally rendering them suitable. I consider it out of the question that they should be raised wherever the Church offers proper accommodation for parishioners within reach. Though new Government churches have been erected in Sutherland there may be (there as elsewhere) as impossibility of bringing all within that reach—but there is only one parish in which it occurs to me that, notwithstanding the recent additions of a Government church, still, from the very inconvenient situation of the parish church in the interior, and the dispersed state of the villages, it would be desirable that the people should have easier access to worship—and on the north coast of the parish of Assynt, a minister and place of worship might be useful—and though I could not give my approbation or assistance to any not connected with the Church, I should be unwilling to refuse a site in such a situation. I should, however, require an acknowledgement to be regularly made in that case, until the time, if it ever occur, of such building coming properly under the Establishment. This principle I consider fully the same as that on which I have always acted, agreeably to the entire concurrence and approbation of the ministers whose change and secession I deplore, while I adhere faithfully to what I think my duty of supporting the Establishment.

Excuse the length of this letter—I wish it could have been more satisfactory to you.—I am, very truly, and faithfully yours,

SUTHERLAND.

---

I.

The reader will find in our columns another epistle from the Duke of Sutherland, in which his Grace reiterates his determination of avoiding the guilt of giving the Free Church sites on his lands. He is placed, he says, in a difficult position. He dislikes religious persecution, and has determined always to oppose whatever tends to it. He entertains, too, from a bias of his very nature, a strong disposition to consult the feelings of the people, even when he considers the people misled and mistaken. But then, being loyally engaged in endeavouring to maintain the Establishment, and being convinced, withal, that the Free Church is an intolerant body, pray, how can he avoid just persecuting a little, or how yield, in the circumstances, to his strong innate desire of conciliating the popular feeling, and acquiescing in the popular will? His Grace is in quite a distressing condition,—torn by conflicting emotions

Nineteen-twentieths of the poor people of Sutherland are adherents of the Free Church,—all of them in whose families the worship of God has been set up,—all who entertain a serious belief in the reality of religion,—all who are not the Duke's own creatures, and have not stifled their convictions for a piece of bread,—are devotedly attached to the disestablished ministers, and will endure none other. The Residuary clergy they do not recognise as clergy at all. The Established churches have become as useless in the district, as if, like its Druidical circles, they represented some gross, idolatrous belief, long exploded,—the people will not enter them; and they respectfully petition his Grace to be permitted to build other churches for themselves. And fain would his Grace indulge them. In accordance with the suggestions of his innate desire, willingly would he permit them to build their own churches and support their own ministers. But then, has he not loyally engaged to support the Establishment? To permit a religious and inoffensive people to build their own places of worship, and support their own clergy, would be sanctioning a sort of persecution against the Establishment; and as his Grace dislikes religious persecution, and has



determined always to oppose whatever tends to it, he has resolved to make use of his influence, as the most extensive of Scottish proprietors, in forcing them back to their parish churches. If they persist in worshipping God agreeably to the dictates of their conscience, it must be on the unsheltered hill-side ;—in winter, amid the frosts and snows of a severe northern climate, —in the milder seasons, exposed to the scorching sun and the drenching shower. They must not be permitted the shelter of a roof,—that would be persecuting the Establishment ; and so to the Establishment must the people be forced back, literally by stress of weather. His Grace owes a debt to the National Institution, and it seems to irk his conscience until some equivalent be made. He is not himself a member,—he exercises the same sort of liberty which his people would so vain exercise,—and to make amends for daring to belong to another Church himself, he has determined that, if he can help it, the people shall belong to no other. He has resolved, it would seem, to compound for his own liberty by depriving them of theirs.

We heard sermon in the open air with a poor Highland congregation in Sutherlandshire only a few weeks ago ; and the scene was one which we shall not soon forget. The place of meeting was a green hill side, near the opening of a deep, long withdrawing strath, with a river running through the midst. We stood on the slope where the last of a line of bold eminence that form the southern side of the valley, sinks towards the sea. A tall precipitous mountain, reverend and hoary, and well fitted to tranquillize the mind, from the sober solemnity that rests on its massy features, rose fronting us on the north ; a quiet burial ground lay at its feet ; while, on the opposite side, between us and the sea, there frowned an ancient stronghold of ragged time-eaten stone,—an impressive memorial of an age of violence and bloodshed. The last proprietor, says tradition, had to quit this dwelling by night, with all his family, in consequence of some unfortunate broil, and take refuge in a small coasting vessel ; a terrible storm arose,—the vessel foundered at sea,—and the hapless proprietor, with his children, were never more heard of. And hence, it is said, the extinction of the race. The story speaks of an unsettled time ; nor is it difficult to trace, in the long deep valley on the opposite hand, the memorials of a story not less sad, though much more modern. On both sides the river the eye rests on a multitude of scattered patches of green, that seem inlaid in the brown heath. We trace on these islands of sward, the marks of furrows, and mark here and there, amid the loneliness, the remains of a group of cottages, well nigh levelled with the soil, and, haply like those ruins which eastern conquerors leave in their track, still scathed with fire. All is solitude within the valley, except where, at wide intervals, the shieling of a shepherd may be seen ; but at its opening, where the hills range to the coast, the cottages for miles together lie clustered as in a hamlet. From the north of Helmsdale to the south of Port Gower, the lower slopes of the hills are covered by a labyrinth of stone fences, reticulated as in a piece of net-work,—minute patches of corn, and endless cottages. It would seem as if for twenty miles the long withdrawing valley had been swept of its inhabitants, and the accumulated sweepings left at its mouth, just as we see the sweepings of a room sometimes left at the door. And such generally is the present state of Sutherland. The interior is a solitude occupied by a few sheep-farmers and their hinds ; while a more numerous population than fell to the share of the entire county, ere the inhabitants were expelled from their snug inland holdings, and left to squat upon the coast, occupies the selva of discontent and poverty that fringes its eastern and western shores. The congregation of the Free Church which we attended on this occasion was drawn mainly from these cottages, and the neighbouring village of Helmsdale. It consisted of from six to

eight hundred Highlanders, all devoted adherents of the Free Church. We have rarely seen a more deeply serious assemblage; it bore, however, an air of deep dejection. The people were wonderfully clean and decent,—for it is ill with Highlanders when they neglect their personal appearance, especially on a Sabbath; but it was all too evident that the heavy hand of poverty rested upon them, and that its evils were now deepened by oppression. It might be a mere trick of association; but when their plaintive Gaelic singing, so melancholy in its tones at all times, arose from the bare hill-side, it sounded in our ears like a deep wail of complaint and sorrow. Poor people! “We were ruined and reduced to beggary before,” they say, “and now the gospel is taken from us.”

How they are to stand out the winter on this exposed eastern coast, He alone knows who never shuts his ear to the cry of the oppressed. One thing is certain,—they will never return to the Establishment. On this Sabbath the congregation in the parish church did not, as we afterwards learned exceed a score; and the *quoad sacra* chapel of the district was locked up. Long before the disruption the people had well-nigh ceased attending the ministrations of the parish incumbent. The Sutherlandshire Highlanders are still a devout people;—they like a bald mediocre essay none the better for its being called a sermon, and read on Sabbath. The Noble Duke, their landlord, has said a good deal in his epistles about the extreme slightness of the difference which obtains between the Free and the Established Churches,—it is a difference so exceedingly slight, that his Grace fails to see it; and he hopes that by and by, when winter shall have thickened the atmosphere with its frost, rain and its snows, his poor tenantry may prove as unable to see it as himself. With them, however, the difference is not mainly a doctrinal one. They believe, with the old Earls of Sutherland, who did much to foster the belief in this northern county, that there is such a thing as personal piety,—that if two clergymen holding nominally the same doctrines, and bound ostensibly by the same standards, one may be a regenerate man, earnestly bent on the conversion of others, and ready to lay down all his worldly possessions, and even life itself, for the cause of the gospel; while the other may be an unregenerate man, so little desirous of the conversion of others, that he would but deery and detest them did he find them converted already, and so careless of the gospel, that did not his living depend on professing to preach it, he would neither be an advocate for it himself, nor yet come within earshot of where it was advocated by others. The Highlanders of Sutherland hold in deep seriousness a belief of this character. They believe, further, that the ministers of their own mountain district belong to these two classes,—that the disruption of the Church has thrown the classes apart,—that the Residuaries are not men of personal piety,—they have seen no conversions attending their ministry,—nor have they lacked reason to doubt their own. Unlike his Grace the Duke, the people have been intelligent enough to see two sets of principles ranged in decided antagonism in the Church question; but still more clearly have they seen two sets of men. They have identified the cause of the gospel with that of the Free Church in their district; and neither the Duke of Sutherland, nor the Establishment which he is “loyally engaged in endeavouring to maintain,” will have influence enough to reverse the opinion.

We have said that his Grace’s ancestors, the old Earls, did much to foster this spirit. The history of Sutherland, as a county, differs from that of all our other Highland districts. Its two great families were those of Reay and Sutherland; and these, from an early period of the Reformation, were not merely Protestant, but thoroughly evangelical. It was the venerable Earl of Sutherland who first subscribed the National Covenant in the Greyfriars.

It was a scion of the Reay family,—a man of great personal piety,—who led the troops of William against Dundee at Killycrankie. Their influence was all-powerful in Sutherland, and directed to the best ends; and we find it stated by Captain Henderson, in his general view of the agriculture of the country, as a well-established and surely not uninteresting fact, that “the crimes of rapine, murder, and plunder, though not unusual in the county during the feuds and conflicts of the clans, were put an end to about the year 1640,”—a full century before our other Highland districts had become even partially civilized. “Pious Earls and Barons of former times,” says a native of the county, in a small work published in Edinburgh about sixteen years ago,” encouraged and patronised pious ministers, and a high tone of religious feeling came thus to be diffused throughout the country.” Its piety was strongly of the Presbyterian type; and in no district of the south were the questions, which received such prominence in our late ecclesiastical controversy, better understood by both the people and the patrons, than in Sutherland a full century ago. We have before us an interesting document, the invitation of the elders, parishioners, and heritors of Lairg, to the Rev. Thomas McKay, 1748, to be their minister, in which, “hoping that” he would find that their “call, carried on with great sincerity, unanimity, and order, was a clear call from the Lord,” they faithfully promise to “yield him, in their several stations and relations, all dutiful respect and encouragement.” William Earl of Sutherland was patron of the parish, but we find him exercising no patronate power on this occasion;—at the head of parishioners and elders, he merely adhibits his name. He merely *invites* with the others. The state of morals in the country was remarkably exemplified at a later period by the regiment of Sutherland Highlanders embodied originally in 1793, under the name of the Sutherlandshire Fencibles, and subsequently in 1800 as the 93d regiment. Most other troops are drawn from among the unsettled and reckless part of the population: not so the Sutherland Highlanders. On the breaking out of the revolutionary war, the mother of the present Duke summoned them from their hills, and five hundred fighting men marched down to Dunrobin Castle, to make a tender of their swords to their country, at the command of their chieftainness. The regiment, therefore, must be regarded as a fair specimen of the character of the district; and from the description of General Stewart of Garth, and one or two other sources besides, we may learn what that character was. “In the words of a general officer, by whom they were once reviewed,” says the General, “they exhibited a perfect pattern of military discipline and moral rectitude.” “When stationed at the Cape of Good Hope, anxious to enjoy the advantages of religious instruction agreeably to the tenets of their national Church, and there being no religious service in the garrison except the customary one of reading prayers to the soldiers on parade, the Sutherland men formed themselves into a congregation, appointed elders of their own number, engaged and paid a stipend (collected among themselves) to a clergyman of the Church of Scotland (who had gone out with an intention of teaching and preaching to the Caffres), and had Divine service performed agreeably to the ritual of the Established Church. \* \* In addition to these expenses, the soldiers regularly remitted money to their relatives in Sutherland. When they disembarked at Plymouth in August 1814, the inhabitants were both surprised and gratified. On such occasions it had been no uncommon thing for soldiers to spend in taverns and gin-shops the money they had saved. In the present case, the soldiers of Sutherland were seen in bookseller’s shops, supplying themselves with Bibles, and such books and tracts as they required. Yet as at the Cape, where their religious habits were so free of all fanatical gloom that they occasionally indulged in social meetings and

dancing, so here, while expending their money on books, they did not neglect their personal appearance; and the haberdasher's shops had also their share of trade, from the purchase of additional feathers to their bonnets, and such extra decorations as the correctness of military regulations allows to be introduced into the uniform. Nor, while thus mindful of themselves,—improving their minds and their personal appearance,—did such of them as had relations in Sutherland forget their destitute condition, occasioned by the loss of their lands, and the operation of the improved state of the country. During the short period that the regiment was quartered at Plymouth, upwards of £500 were lodged in one banking-house, to be remitted to Sutherland, exclusive of many sums sent through the Post-Office and by officers. Some of these sums exceeded £20 from an individual soldier."

"In the case of such men," continues the General "disgraceful punishment was as unnecessary as it would have been pernicious. Indeed, so remote was the idea of such a measure in regard to them, that when punishments were to be inflicted on others, and the troops in camp, garrison, or quarters, assembled to witness their execution, the presence of the Sutherland Highlanders,—either of the fencibles or of the line,—was dispensed with; the effect of terror, as a check to crime, being in their case uncalled for, *as examples of that nature were not necessary for such honourable soldiers.*' Such were these men in garrison. How thoroughly they were guided by honour and loyalty in the field, was shown at New Orleans. Although many of their countrymen who had emigrated to America were ready and anxious to receive them, there was not an instance of desertion; nor did one of those who were left behind wounded or prisoners, forget their allegiance and remain in that country,—at the same time that desertions from the British army were but too frequent."

This is testimony which even men of the world will scarce suspect. We can supplement it by that of the missionary whom the Sutherlandshire soldiers made choice of at Cape Town as their minister. We quote from a letter by the Rev. Mr. Thom, which appeared in the *Christian Herald* of October 1814:—

"When the 93d Sutherland Highlanders left Cape Town last month," writes the reverend gentleman, "there were among them 156 members of the Church (including three elders and three deacons), all of whom, so far as man can know the heart from the life, were pious persons. The regiment was certainly a pattern for morality and good behaviour to every other corps. They read their Bibles; they observed the Sabbath; they saved their money in order to do good: 7000 rix-dollars (£1400 currency), the non-commissioned officers and privates gave for books, societies, and the support of the gospel,—a sum perhaps unparalleled in any other corps in the world, given in the short space of seventeen or eighteen months. Their example had a general good effect on both the colonists and the heathen. How they may act as to religion in other parts, is known to God; but it ever apostolic days were revived in modern times on earth, I certainly believe some of these to have been granted to us in Africa."

One other extract of a similar kind: we quote from a letter to the Committee of the Edinburgh Gaelic School Society,—Fourth Annual Report:—

"The regiment (93d) arrived in England, when they immediately received orders to proceed to North America; but before they re-embarked, the sum collected for your Society was made up, and has been remitted to your treasurer, amounting to seventy-eight pounds sterling."

We dwell with pleasure on this picture; and shall take an early opportunity of presenting the readers with a picture of similar character, taken from observation of the homes in which these soldiers were reared. The reverse is all too stern, but we must exhibit it also, and show how the influence which the old Earls of Sutherland employed so well, has been exerted by their descendants to the ruin of their country. For the present, we conclude with a few additional remarks by General Stewart:—

"Men like these," he says, referring to the Sutherland Highlanders, "do credit to the peasantry of the country. If this conclusion is well founded, the removal of so many of the people from their ancient seats, where they acquired those habits and prin-

ciples, must be considered a public loss of no common magnitude. It must appear strange and somewhat inconsistent, when the same persons who are loud in their professions of an eager desire to promote and preserve the religious and moral virtues of the people, should so frequently take the lead in approving of measures which, by removing them from where they imbibed principles which have attracted the notice of Europe, and place them in situations where poverty and the too-frequent attendants vice and crime, will lay the foundation for a character which will be a disgrace, as that already obtained has been an honour, to this country. In the new stations, where so many Highlanders are now placed, and crowded in such numbers as to preserve the numerical population, while whole districts are left without inhabitants, how can they resume their ancient character and principles, which, according to the reports of those employed by the proprietors, have been so deplorably broken down and deteriorated,—a deterioration which was entirely unknown till the recent change in the condition of the people, and the introduction of that system of placing families on patches of potatoe ground, as in Ireland,—a system pregnant with degradation, poverty, and disaffection, and exhibiting daily a prominent and deplorable example, which might have forewarned Highland proprietors, and prevented them from reducing their people to a similar state? It is only when parents and heads of families in the Highlands are moral, happy, and contented, that they can instil sound principles into their children, who in their intercourse with the world may once more become what the men of Sutherland have already been, ‘an honourable example, worthy the imitation of all.’”

---

## II.

We have exhibited the Sutherland Highlanders as they exhibited themselves to their country, when, as Christian soldiers,—men, like the old chivalrous knight, “without fear or reproach,”—they fought its battles and reflected honour on its name. Interest must attach to the manner in which men of so high a moral tone were reared; and a sketch drawn from personal observation of the interior of Sutherland eight-and-twenty years ago, may be found to throw very direct light on the subject. To know what the district once was, and what it is now, is to know with peculiar emphasis the meaning of the sacred text—“One sinner destroyeth much good.”

The eye of a Triptolemus Yellowlee would have found exceedingly little to gratify it in the parish of Lairg thirty years ago. The parish had its bare hills, its wide, dark moors, its old doddered woods of birch and hazel, its extensive lake, its headlong river, and its roaring cataract. Nature had imparted to it much of a wild and savage beauty; but art had done nothing for it. To reverse the well known antithesis in which Goldsmith sums up his description of Italy, the only growth that had *not* dwindled in it was man. The cottage in which we resided with an aged relative and his two stalwart sons, might be regarded as an average specimen of the human dwellings of the district. It was a low, long building of turf, consisting of four apartments on the ground floor,—the one struck on to the end of the other, and threaded together by a passage that connected the whole. From the nearest hill the cottage reminded one of a huge black snail crawling up the slope. The largest of the four apartments was occupied by the master's six milk cows; the next in size was the ha', or sitting room, a rude but not uncomfortable apartment, with the fire on a large flat stone in the middle of the floor. The apartment adjoining was decently partitioned into sleeping places; while the fourth and last in the range,—more neatly fitted up than any of the others, with furniture, the workmanship of a bred carpenter, a small book-case containing from forty to fifty volumes, and a box-bed of deal,—was known as the stranger's room. There was a straggling group of buildings outside, in the same humble style,—a stable, a barn, a hay-barn, a sheep-pen with a shed attached, and a milk-house; and stretching around the whole lay the farm,—a straggling patch of corn-land of from twelve to fifteen acres in extent. that, from its extremely irregular outline, and the eccentric forms of the party-coloured divisions into which it was parcelled

out, reminded one of a coloured map. Encircling all was a wide sea of heath studded with huge stones,—the pasturage land of the farmer for his sheep and cattle, which swept away on every hand to other islands of corn and other groups of cottages, identical in appearance with the corn-land and the cottages described.

We remember that, coming from a sea-port town, where, to give to property the average security, the usual means had to be resorted to, we were first struck by finding that the doors of our relative's cottage, in this inland parish, were furnished with neither lock nor bar. Like that of the hermit in the ballad, they opened simply with a latch, but, unlike that of the hermit, it was not because there were no stores under the humble roof to demand the care of the master. It was because that, at this comparatively recent period, the crime of theft was unknown in the district. The philosophic Biot, when occupied in measuring the time of the seconds, pendulum, resided for several months in one of the smaller Shetland islands; and, fresh from the troubles of France,—his imagination bearing about, if we may so speak, the stains of the guillotine,—the state of trustful security in which he found the simple inhabitants filled him with astonishment. "Here," he exclaimed, "during the twenty-five years in which Europe has been devouring herself, the door of the house I inhabit has remained open day and night." The whole interior of Sutherland was, at the time of which we write, in a similar condition. It did not surprise us that the old man, a person of deep piety, regularly assembled his household night and morning for the purposes of family worship, and led in their devotions,—we had seen many such instances in the low country; but it did somewhat surprise us to find the practice universal in the parish. In every family had the worship of God been set up;—one could not pass an inhabited cottage in the evening, from which the voice of psalms was not to be heard. On Sabbath morning, the whole population might be seen wending their way, attired in their best, along the blind half-green paths in the heath, to the parish church. The minister was greatly beloved, and all attended his ministrations. We still remember the intense joy which his visits used to impart to the household of our relative. This worthy clergyman still lives, though the infirmities of a stage of life very advanced have gathered round him; and at the late disruption, choosing his side, and little heeding, when duty called, that his strength had been wasted in the labour of forty years, and that he could now do little more than testify and suffer in behalf of his principles, he resigned his hold of the temporalities as minister of Dornoch, and cast in his lot with his brethren of the Free Church. And his venerable successor in Lairg, a man equally beloved and exemplary, and now on the verge of his eightieth year, has acted a similar part. Had such sacrifices been made in such circumstances for other than the cause of Christ.—had they been made under some such romantic delusion as misled of old the followers of the Stuarts,—the world would have appreciated them highly; but there is an element in evangelism which repels admiration, unless it be an admiration grounded in faith and love; and the appeal in such cases must lie, therefore, not to the justice of the world, but to the judgment-seat of God. We may remind the reader, in the passing, that it was the venerable minister of Lairg who, on quitting his manse on the disruption, was received by his widowed daughter into a cottage held of the Duke of Sutherland, and that for this grave crime,—the crime of sheltering her aged father, the daughter was threatened with ejection by one of the Duke's creatures. It is not somewhat necessary that the breath of public opinion should be let in on this remote county? But we digress.

A peculiar stillness seemed to rest over this Highland parish on the Sabbath. The family devotions of the morning, the journey to and from

church, and the public services there, occupied fully two-thirds of the day. But there remained the evening, and of it the earlier part was spent in what are known in the north country as fellowship meetings. One of these held regularly in the "ha'" of our relative. From fifteen to twenty people, inclusive of the family, met for the purposes of social prayer and religious conversation, and the time passed profitably away, till the closing night summoned the members of the meeting to their respective homes and their family duties. We marked an interesting peculiarity in the devotions of our relative: He was, as we have said, an old man, and had worshipped in his family long ere Dr. Stewart's Gaelic translation of the Scriptures had been introduced into the country; and as he was supplied in those days with only the English Bible, while his domestics understood only Gaelic, he had to acquire the art, not uncommon in Sutherland at the time, of translating the English chapter for them as he read, into their native tongue; and this he had learned to do with such ready fluency, that no one could have guessed it to be other than a Gaelic work from which he was reading. It might have been supposed, however, that the introduction of Dr. Stewart's edition would have rendered this mode of translation obsolete; but in this, and many other families, such was not the case. The old man's Gaelic was Sutherlandshire Gaelic. His family understood it better in consequence, than any other; and so he continued to translate from his English Bible, *ad aperturam libri*, many years after the Gaelic edition had been spread over the county. The fact that such a practice should have been common in Sutherland, says something surely for the intelligence of the family patriarchs of the district. That thousands of the people who knew the Scriptures through no other medium, should have been intimately acquainted with the saving doctrines, and witnesses of their power (and there can be no question that such was the case), is proof enough, at least, that it was a practice carried on with a due perception of the scope and meaning of the sacred volume. One is too apt to associate intelligence with the external improvements of a country,—with well-enclosed fields and whitewashed cottages; but the association is altogether a false one. As shown by the testimony of General Stewart of Garth, the Sutherland regiment was not only the most eminently moral, but, as their tastes and habits demonstrated, one of the most decidedly intellectual under the British Crown. Our relative's cottage had, as we have said, its book-case, and both his sons were very intelligent men; but intelligence derived directly from books was not general in the county; a very considerable portion of the people understood no other language than Gaelic, and many of them could not even read; for at this period about one-tenth of the families of Sutherland were distant five or more miles from the nearest school. Their characteristic intelligence was of a kind otherwise derived,—it was an intelligence drawn from these domestic readings of the Scriptures and from the pulpit; and it referred mainly to that profound science which even a Newton could recognise as more important and wonderful than any of the others, but which many of the shallower intellects of our own times deem no science at all. It was an intelligence out of which their morality sprung;—it was an intelligence founded in earnest belief.

We would but fatigue our readers were we to run over half our recollections of the interior of Sutherland. They are not all of a serious cast. We have sat in the long autumn evenings in the cheerful circle round the turf-fire of the ha', and have heard many a tradition of old clan feuds pleasingly told, and many a song of the poet of the county, Old Rob Donn, gaily sung. There was a spot of green meadow land in our immediate neighbourhood, by the side of a small stream,—small, but not without its supply of brown trout, speckled with crimson,—on which the young men of the neighbourhood used not unfrequently to meet and try their vigour in throwing the

stone. The stone itself had its history. It was a ball of gneiss, round as a bullet, that had once surmounted the gable of a small Popish chapel of which there now remained only a shapeless heap of stone, that scarce overtopped the long grass amid which it lay. A few undressed flags indicated an ancient burying ground,—and over the ruined heap, and the rude tombstones that told no story, ancient time-hallowed tree, coeval with the building, stretched out its giant arms. Even the sterner occupations of the farm had in their very variety a strong sinack of enjoyment. We found one of the old man's sons engaged during our one visit in building an out-house, after the primitive fashion of the Highlands, and during our other visit in constructing a plough. The two main *cupples* of the building he made of huge trees, dug out of a neighbouring morass ;—they resembled somewhat the beams of a large sloop reversed ;—the stones he carried from the outfield heath on a sledge ; the interstices in the walls he caulked with moss ;—the roof he covered with sods ;—the entire erection was his workmanship from foundation to ridge. And such, in brief, was the history of all those cottages in the interior of Sutherland, which the poor Highlanders so naturally deemed their own, but from which, when set on fire and burnt to the ground by the creatures of the proprietor, they were glad to escape with their lives. The plough, with the exception of the iron work, was altogether our relative's workmanship too. And such was the history of the rude implements of rural or domestic labour which were consumed in the burning dwellings. But we anticipate.

There is little of gaiety or enjoyment among the Highlanders of Sutherland now. We spent a considerable time for two several years among their thickly clustered cottages on the eastern coast, and saw how they live, and how it happens that when years of comparative scarcity come on they starve. Most of them saved when in the interior, as we have said, a little money ; but the process has been reversed here ;—in every instance in which they brought their savings to the coast side the fund been dissipated. Each cottage has from half an acre to an acre-and-a-half of corn land attached to it, —just such patches as the Irish starve upon. In some places the soil has been considerably improved by dint of much labour, and all that seems necessary to render it worth the care of a family would be just to increase its extent some ten or twelve fold,—in other cases, however, increase would be no advantage : we find it composed of a loose debris of granitic water-rolled pebbles and ferruginous sand, that seems destined to perpetual barrenness. The rents, in every instance, seem moderate ;—the money of the tenant flows towards the landlord in a stream of not half the volume of that in which the money of the landlord must flow towards the tenant when the poor-laws shall be extended to Scotland. But no rent, in such circumstances, can be really moderate. A clergyman, when asked to say how many of his parishioners, in one of these coast districts, realized less than sixpence a-day, replied, that it would be a much easier matter for him to point out how many of them realised more than sixpence, as this more fortunate class were exceedingly few. And, surely, no rent can be moderate that is paid by a man who realises less than sixpence a-day. It is the peculiar evil produced by the change in Sutherland, that it has doomed the population of the country to a condition in which no rent can be moderate,—to a condition in which they but barely avoid famine, when matters are at the best with them, and fall into it in every instance in which the herring fishing, their main and most precarious stay, partially fails, or their crops are just a little more than usually scanty. They are in that state that their very means of living are sources, not of comfort, but of distress to them. When the fishing and their crops are comparatively abundant, they live on the bleak edge of want ; while failure in either plunges them into a state of intense suffering. And



well are these Highlanders aware of the true character of the revolution to which they have been subjected. Our Poor Law Commissioners may find in this land of growing pauperism thousands as poor as the people of Sutherland, but they will find no class of the population who can so directly contrast their present state of destitution with a state of comparative plenty and enjoyment, or who in consequence of possessing this sad ability, are so deeply imbued with a too well-grounded and natural discontent.

But we have not yet said how this ruinous revolution was effected in Sutherland,—how the aggravations of its *mode*, if we may so speak, still faster in the recollections of the people, or how thoroughly that policy of the lord of the soil, through which he now seems determined to complete the work of ruin which his predecessor began, harmonizes with its worst details. We must first relate, however, a disastrous change which took place, in the providence of God, in the character of the noble family of Sutherland, and which, though it dates fully eighty years back, may be regarded as pregnant with the disasters which afterwards befell the country.

### III.

Such of our readers as are acquainted with the memoir of Lady Glenorchy, must remember a deeply melancholy incident which occurred in the history of this excellent woman, in connection with the noble family of Sutherland. Her only sister had been married to William, seventeenth Earl of Sutherland,—“the last of the good Earls;” “a nobleman,” says the Rev. Dr. Jones, in his Memoir, “who to the finest person united all the dignity and amenity of manners and character which give lustre to greatness.” But his sun was destined soon to go down. Five years after his marriage, which proved one of the happiest, and was blessed with two children, the elder of the two, the young Lady Catherine, a singularly engaging child, was taken from him by death, in his old hereditary castle of Dunrobin. The event deeply affected both parents, and preyed on their health and spirits. It had taken place amid the gloom of a severe northern winter, and in the solitude of the Highlands; and, acquiescing in the advice of friends, the Earl and his lady quitted the family seat, where there was so much to remind them of their bereavement, and sought relief in the more cheerful atmosphere of Bath. But they were not to find it there. Shortly after their arrival, the Earl was seized by a malignant fever, with which, upheld by a powerful constitution, he struggled for fifty-four days, and then expired. “For the first twenty-one days and nights of these,” says Dr. Jones, “Lady Sutherland never left his bed-side, and then at last, overcome with fatigue, anxiety, and grief, she sank an unavailing victim to an amiable but excessive attachment, seventeen days before the death of her lord.” The period, though not very remote, was one in which the intelligence of events travelled slowly; and in this instance the distraction of the family must have served to retard it beyond the ordinary time. Her Ladyship’s mother, when hastening from Edinburgh to her assistance, alighted one day from her carriage at an inn, and, on seeing two hearses standing by the way side, inquired of an attendant whose remains they contained? The remains, was the reply, of Lord and Lady Sutherland, on their way for interment to the Royal Chapel of Holyrood House. And such was the first intimation which the lady received of the death of her daughter and son-in-law.

The event was pregnant with disaster to Sutherland, though many years elapsed ere the ruin which it involved fell on that hapless country. The sole survivor and heir of the family was a female infant of but a year old. Her maternal grandmother, an ambitious, intriguing woman of the world, had the chief share in her general training and education; and she was

brought up in the south of Scotland, in which her grandmother was a native far removed from the influence of those genial sympathies with the people of her clan, for which the old lords of Sutherland had been so remarkable, and, what was a sorer evil still, from the influence of the vitalities of that religion which, for five generations together, her fathers had illustrated and adorned. The especial mode in which the disaster told first, was through the patronages of the county, the larger part of which are vested in the family of Sutherland. Some of the old Earls had been content, as we have seen, to place themselves on the level of the Christian men of their parishes, and thus to unite with them in calling to their churches, the Christian ministers of their choice. They knew,—what regenerate natures can alone know, with the proper emphasis,—that in Christ Jesus the vassal ranks with his Lord, and they conscientiously acted on the conviction. But matters were now regulated differently. The presentation supplanted the call, and ministers came to be placed in the parishes of Sutherland, without the consent, and contrary to the will, of the people. Churches well filled hitherto, were deserted by their congregations, just because a respectable woman of the world, making free use of what she deemed her own, had planted them with men of the world who were only tolerably respectable; and in houses and barns, the devout men of the district learned to hold numerous-attended Sabbath meetings for reading the Scriptures, mutual exhortation, and prayer, as a sort of substitutes for the public services in which they found they could no longer join with profit. The spirit awakened by the old Earls had survived themselves, and ran directly counter to the policy of their descendant. Strongly attached to the Establishment, the people, though they thus forsook their old places of worship, still remained members of the national Church, and travelled far in the summer season to attend the better ministers of their own and the neighbouring counties. We have been assured, too, from men whose judgment we respect, that, under all these disadvantages, religion continued peculiarly to flourish among them;—a deep-toned evangelism prevailed; so that perhaps the visible Church throughout the world at the time could furnish no more striking contrast than that which obtained between the cold, bald, common-place services of the pulpit in some of these parishes, and the fervid prayers and exhortations which gave life and interest to these humble meetings of the people. What a pity it is that differences such as these the Duke of Sutherland cannot see!

The marriage of the young Countess into a noble English family was fraught with further disaster to the county. There are many Englishmen quite intelligent enough to perceive the difference between a smoky cottage of turf and a white washed cottage of stone, whose judgment on their respective inhabitants would be of but little value. Sutherland, as a county of *men*, stood higher at this period than perhaps any other district in the British empire; but, as our descriptions in our last must have shown,—and we indulged in them mainly with a view to this part of our subject,—it by no means stood high as a county of farms and cottages. The marriage of the Countess brought a new set of eyes upon it,—eyes accustomed to quite a different face of things. It seemed a wild, rude country, where all was wrong, and all had to be set right,—a sort of Russia on a small scale, that had just got another Peter the Great to civilize it,—or a sort of barbarous Egypt, with an energetic Ali Pasha at its head. Even the vast wealth and great liberality of the Stafford family militated against this hapless county: it enabled them to treat it as the mere subject of an interesting experiment, in which gain to themselves was really no object,—nearly as little so as if they had resolved on dissecting a dog alive, for the benefit of science. It was a still further disadvantage, that they had to carry on their experiment by the hands, and to watch its first effects with the eyes, of others. The

agonies of the dog might have had their softening influence on a dissector who held the knife himself; but there could be no such influence exerted upon him, did he merely issue imperative orders to his footmen, that the dissection should be completed, remaining himself, meanwhile, out of sight and out of hearing. The plan of improvement sketched out by this English family was a plan exceedingly easy of conception. Here is a vast tract of land, furnished with two distinct sources of wealth. Its shores may be made the seats of extensive fisheries, and the whole of its interior parcelled out into productive sheep-farms. All is waste in its present state: it has no fisheries, and two-thirds of its internal produce is consumed by the inhabitants. True, it contributed, for the use of the community and the landlord, its large herds of black cattle, but the English family saw, and we believe saw very truly, that for every one pound of beef which it produced, it could be made to produce two pounds of mutton, and perhaps a pound of fish in addition. And so it was resolved, therefore, that the inhabitants of the central districts, who, as they were mere Celts, without energy or capital, could not be transformed, it was held, into store farmers, should be marched down to the sea-side, there to convert themselves into fishermen, on the shortest possible notice, and that a few farmers with capital, of the industrious Lowland race, should be invited to occupy the new subdivisions of the interior. And, pray, what objection can be urged against so liberal and large-minded a scheme? The poor inhabitants of the interior had very serious objections to urge against it. Their homes were of their own rearing,—it was they themselves who had broken in their little fields from the waste,—from time immemorial, far beyond the reach of history, had they possessed their mountain holdings; they had defended them so well of old, that the soil was still virgin ground, in which the invader had found only a grave; and their young men were now in foreign lands, fighting, at the command of their chieftainess, the battles of their country,—not in the character of hired soldiers, but of men who regarded these very holdings as their stake in the quarrel. To them, then, the scheme seemed fraught with the most flagrant, the most monstrous injustice. Were it to be suggested by some Chartist convention in a time of revolution, that Sutherland might be still further improved,—that it was really a piece of great waste to suffer the revenues of so extensive a district to be squandered by one individual,—that it would be much better to appropriate them to the use of the community in general,—that the community in general might be still further benefited by the removal of the one said individual from Dunrobin to a roadside, where he might be profitably employed in breaking stones,—and that this new arrangement could not be entered on too soon,—the noble Duke could not be a whit more astonished, or rendered a whit more indignant, by the scheme, than were the Highlanders of Sutherland by the scheme of his predecessor.

The reader must keep in view, therefore, that if atrocities unexampled in Britain for at least a century were perpetrated in the *clearing* of Sutherland there was a species of at least passive resistance on the part of the people (for active resistance there was none), which in some degree provoked them. Had the Highlanders, on receiving orders, marched down to the sea coast, and become fishermen, with the readiness with which a regiment deploys on review day, the atrocities would, we doubt, not have been much fewer. But though the orders were very distinct, the Highlanders were very unwilling to obey; and the severities formed merely a part of the means through which the necessary obedience was ultimately secured. We shall instance a single case, as illustrative of the process. In the month of March 1814, a large proportion of the Highlanders of Farr and Kildonan, two parishes in Sutherland, were summoned to quit their farms in the following May. In a few days after, the surrounding heaths on which they pastured their

cattle, and from which at that season the sole supply of herbage is derived (for in those northern districts the grass springs late, and the cattle-feeder in the spring months depends chiefly on the heather), were set on fire and burnt up. There was that sort of policy in the stroke which men deem allowable in a state of war. The starving cattle went roaming over the burnt pastures, and found nothing to eat. Many of them perished, and the greater part of what remained, though in miserable condition, the Highlanders had to sell perforce. Most of the able-bodied men were engaged in this latter business at a distance from home, when the dreaded term-day came on. The pasturage had been destroyed before the legal term, and while, in even the eye of the law, it was still the property of the poor Highlanders; but ere disturbing them in their dwellings, term-day was suffered to pass. The work of demolition then began. A numerous party of men, with a factor at their head, entered the district, and commenced pulling down the houses over the heads of the inhabitants. In an extensive tract of country not a human dwelling was left standing, and then, the more effectually to prevent their temporary re-erection, the destroyers set fire to the wreck. In one day were the people deprived of home and shelter, and left exposed to the elements. Many deaths are said to have ensued from alarm, fatigue, and cold. Pregnant women were taken with premature labour in the open air. There were old men who took to the woods and rocks in a state of partial insanity. An aged bedridden man, named Macbeath, had his house unroofed over his head, and was left exposed to wind and rain till death put a period to his sufferings. Another man lying ill of a fever met with no tenderer treatment, but in his case the die turned up life. A bedridden woman, nearly a hundred years of age, had her house fired over her and ere she could be extricated from the burning wreck, the sheets in which she was carried were on fire. She survived but for five days after. In a critique on the work of Sismondi, which appeared a few months since in the *Westminster Review*, the writer tells us, "it has even been said that an old man, having refused to quit his cabin, perished in the flames." But such was not the fact. The constituted authorities interfered: a precognition was taken by the Sheriff-Substitute of the county, and the case tried before the Justiciary Court at Inverness; but the trial terminated in the acquittal of the pannels. There was no punishable crime proven to attach to the agents of the proprietor.

Their acquittal was followed by scenes of a similar character with the scene described, and of even still greater atrocity. But we must borrow the description of one of these from the historian of the *clearing* of Sutherland, —Donald M'Leod, a native of the county, and himself a sufferer in the experimental process to which it was subjected:—

"The work of devastation was begun by setting fire to the houses of the small tenants in extensive districts,—Farr, Rogart, Golspie, and the whole parish of Kildonan. I was an eye-witness of the scene. The calamity came on the people quite unexpectedly. Strong parties for each district, furnished with faggots and other combustibles, rushed on the dwellings of the devoted people, and immediately commenced setting fire to them, proceeding in their work with the greatest rapidity, till about three hundred houses were in flames. Little or no time was given for the removal of persons or property,—the consternation and confusion were extreme,—the people striving to remove the sick and the helpless before the fire should reach them,—next struggling to save the most valuable of their effects,—the cries of the women and children,—the roaring of the affrighted cattle, hunted by the dogs of the shepherds amid the smoke and the fire,—altogether composed a scene that completely baffles description. A dense cloud of smoke enveloped the whole country by day, and even extended far on the sea. At night, an awfully grand, but terrific scene, presented itself,—all the houses in an extensive district in flames at once. I myself ascended a height about eleven o'clock in the evening, and counted two hundred and fifty blazing houses, many of the owners of which were my relations, and all of whom I personally knew, but whose

present condition I could not tell. The conflagration lasted six days, till the whole of the dwellings were reduced to ashes or smoking ruins. During one of these days, a boat lost her way in the dense smoke as she approached the shore, but at night she was enabled to reach a landing place by the light of the flames."

But, to employ the language of Southey,

"Things such as these, we know, must be  
At every famous victory."

And in this instance the victory of the lord of the soil over the children of the soil was signal and complete. In little more than nine years a population of fifteen thousand individuals were removed from the interior of Sutherland to its sea coasts, or had emigrated to America. The inland districts were converted into deserts, through which the traveller may take a long day's journey, amid ruins that still bear the scathe of fire, and grassy patches betraying, when the evening sun casts aslant its long deep shadows, the half-effaced lines of the plough. The writer of the singularly striking passage we have just quoted, revisited his native place (Kildonan) in the year 1828, and attended divine service in the parish church. A numerous and devout congregation had once worshipped there;—the congregation now consisted of eight shepherds and their *dogs*. In a neighbouring district, the Barony of Strathnaver, a portion of the parish of Farr,—the church, no longer found necessary, was razed to the ground. The timber was carried away to be used in the erection of an inn, and the minister's house converted into the dwelling of a fox-hunter. "A woman well known in the parish," says M'Leod, "happening to traverse the Strath the year after the burning; was asked, on her return, what news? 'Oh,' said she, '*sgeul bronach, sgeul bronach!* sad news, sad news! I have seen the timber of our kirk covering the inn at Altuaharran; I have seen the kirkyard, where our friends are mouldering, filled with tarry sheep, and Mr. Sage's study-room a kennel for Robert Gun's dogs.'"

One effect of this treatment of the Highlanders throws a somewhat curious light on the Celtic character. All our readers are acquainted with that story of the warming-pan which was found of such use to the Orange and Hanoverian party, in enlisting the common people on their side against the Pretender. The Pretender was no scion of the Stuarts, it was said, but some bantling that had been introduced for State purposes into the Queen's bed-chamber in a warming-pan. A somewhat similar story, current among the Highlanders of Sutherland, cuts off, in like manner, the line of the "good Earls" from that of the present family, their descendants. How the story should have first originated, we know not; but it is not difficult to comprehend the principle on which, when once originated, it should be sedulously kept up. Regarding the memory of their ancient lords with all the love and veneration which is so peculiar to the Celtic character,—full of recollections of their high worth, their patriotic feeling, their considerate kindness and paternal regard,—proud, too, of their long line of a thousand years,—they feel it a too harsh transition to pass at once, without break or pause, if we may so speak, to the family by which they have been peeled, scattered, degraded, undone. There is a wide gulf between the set of feelings with which they regard the last, and those with which they regard the previous generations of their hereditary lords; and they snatch at whatever serves to show that the hiatus may be as much a matter of fact as of emotion. The effacement of the story,—the removal of the feeling which gives it body, though all bodiless in itself, because its existence is felt to be a relief,—would be a feat worthy of the Duke of Sutherland. Kindness would efface it, thoroughly and soon,—it is sort of fever-spot that shows the state of the patient. We have heard its details given with amusing minuteness. In the

house in Edinburgh in which the infant daughter of the dead Lord and Lady Sutherland lodged (her grandmother's, we believe), there was another little girl of the same age,—a relative of the old lady's also, though a more distant one. The children were companions. An old trusted domestic from Dunrobin, Robert M'Donald, or Harrald, was regularly in the practice of taking a yearly journey to Edinburgh laden with little presents for the departed chief's daughter, now the sole hope of the clan. On every occasion, the young chieftainess used to come running to meet him, and proud was the old man to report her progress to the clansmen on each return to Dunrobin. Intelligence reached the north that she had lost her young companion by death; and on the next visit of M'Donald there was a little girl who came meeting him as usual,—but a lady attended her on this occasion, and the little girl was *not* his chief's daughter. "Where," he hastily asked, "is Betsie?" "There," said the lady, pointing to the little girl. "No, no," exclaimed the old man, "not there—where is Betsie Sutherland?" The lady deigning him no reply, snatched up her charge hastily as if in anger, and old Robert never again saw the heiress of Dunrobin. And such is the story.—But we have exhausted our space, without yet exhausting our subject.

#### IV.—A FEW WORDS ON THE PATRONAGE ACT OF QUEEN ANNE.

As considerable misapprehension exists on this subject, it may be convenient to our readers, to hear a short explanation of it—an explanation free from technicalities, and appealing to their plain common sense, and to their Christian principles.

The facts to be dealt with are these :—when the long period of the Church of Scotland's sufferings was terminated by the glorious Revolution of 1688, it remained to settle the terms of her alliance with the State. This was done in what is called the famous Revolution Settlement of 1690, whereby the Presbyterian religion was again made the national religion. The old rights of the Kirk were restored to her, and Patronage was formally abolished. By that settlement it was provided, that for the future, in case of vacancies, the heritors and elders of each parish, were to name and propose a person to be Minister of their parish, and the people were then to declare their approval or disapproval.

Afterwards, in Queen Anne's days, England and Scotland were united; but Scotland would not agree to that union, until an Act of security was passed to guaranty the continuance of her Church and Discipline, "unalterable;" and this Act was accordingly embodied in the Act of Union, and was declared to be a "fundamental and essential condition of the Union."

But in a few years after, by a series of wicked intrigues, the Protestant and tolerant party was ejected from office, and Lord Bolingbroke and other Jacobites succeeded. One of the plans of this unscrupulous

ministry was to sow dissensions in Scotland ; and accordingly they passed an Act *restoring Patronage*. That Act was proposed in Parliament by a gentleman, who was afterwards, by the Pretender, created a Viscount for his services to the Jacobite cause. The people were indignant ; they rightly judged that the imperial Parliament had violated the Act of Union ; and they strenuously protested against a measure, which, instead of allowing each congregation's Minister to be proposed to them, by the heritors of the parish and the elders of that parish, gave the right of nominating him to certain persons named patrons, and required no other qualification to make them judges of a Minister's competency, than the possession of certain property ;—a patron, in fact, might be an Episcopalian or a Socinian or an infidel, as many of them have been, and are.

Of late it has been determined by two judges in the House of Lords, that this Act of Queen Anne goes to this extent ; namely, to the extent of giving patrons a right to present a presentee, and to have him inducted as Minister, even although all the parish protests against him. The words of the Act are : “ it shall and may be lawful for Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, and for every other person or persons who have right to any patronage or patronages of any Church or Churches whatsoever, in that part of Great Britain, called Scotland, to present a qualified Minister or Ministers to any Church or Churches, whereof they are patrons, which shall happen to be vacant ; and the Presbytery of the respective bounds shall, and is hereby obliged to receive and admit in the same such qualified person or persons, Minister or Ministers, as shall be presented by the respective patrons, *as the person or Ministers presented before the making of this Act, ought to have been admitted.*”

On this provision, it is clear, that the main question to be determined is, *what was the rule “before the making of this Act?”* The answer is exceedingly simple ; the rule to guide the Presbyteries was that which had been established at the Revolution, and guaranteed and secured by the Union, and had been without any sort of interruption whatever, acted on, up to the moment of the passing of the Act in question. And what was that rule ? why this : that all presentees should be first named to the congregations, to be approved or disapproved of, by them.

But the House of Lords says, *no* ;—the approval or disapproval of the people, is not to be considered. Why ? Let us hear one of the learned Judges—Lord Brougham. At very great length he contends, that the Statute of Anne could not have *meant* to continue the rights of the people to dissent ; that if it did, it was “ *gross blundering* ;” that to say that it did, is “ *grossly indecorous*” towards the Legislature, and “ *very absurd* ;” that, really, is the gist of what his Lordship has said on this subject.

Now, let us ask, is this a fair, is this a dignified and judicial way of dealing with a vast question of immense national importance ? Lord Brougham was called upon to say what the law was ; not what it ought to have been, not what it might have been. And instead of deciding that case on the simple construction of statutes, he proceeds to explain

the words which the Bolingbroke Ministry used, by the policy which, if they had dared, they would have pursued,—the policy which they are supposed to have designed to carry into effect. But the point at issue, is, not what that Ministry *designed* to do, but what actually, and in fact, they *did*. They *designed* to prevent the Hanoverian Succession; they *designed* to repeal the Toleration Act; they *designed* to assist Popery, but in the then state of public opinion, they could only indicate these designs, so far as to alarm the nation; they had not the power nor the courage to do more; and accordingly they did not do more. They did not prevent the Hanoverian Succession; they did not repeal the Toleration Act; they did not re-establish Popery—why, then should it be concluded, that because they are believed to have *designed* to abolish the popular Veto in Scotland, *therefore*, it is clear that in fact, they did so? They did not do so in words; *that* is admitted; but then the words they did use, must forsooth, be construed to mean that they did so in fact, *because* in their secret purposes, one purpose was to do so!—The plain truth is, that they knew that “the pear was not ripe;” that they might hope to succeed in restoring Patronage, but the popular Veto they could not then hope to abolish. And what was the practical effect of their measure which they did venture to propose? So far from it actually destroying the Veto, no Patron for about twenty years after it passed, dared even to nominate a presentee—so jealous were the people, even of *that* encroachment. And if the people were violent against even that, is it credible, that more, *that* so much more as must have caused (as it *has* lately caused) a total disruption of the establishment, would have been then attempted?

The general rule for the construction of penal rules and statutes, is always to restrain their operation to the very things which they are aimed at. What they do not distinctly include, they shall not be construed to include. In other words there shall be no penalties or persecution, by implication. But lo! Lord Brougham would construe this Act of Queen Anne, not by its words, but in spite of its words, to include the abolition of the dearest and most valuable, and most anxiously cherished rights of the Scottish people.

Again, if the Act of Queen Anne, really does abolish the Veto of the people, how then does it happen, that up to 1835, no writer on Scotch Law, no single Judge, no Court of Law, ever before dreamt that it had this effect, or any thing like this effect, but on the contrary allowed the Church in many cases to set aside presentees, on the very ground, that they were vetoed by the people? For more than 120 years, this Statute was denounced by many of the chief Scotsmen, because it transferred the right of nominating presentees from the heritors and elders, to the patrons. No writer for or against it, ever said that it did more; there is no sort of precedent to show that in fact it ever did more;—till 1835; and then for the first time the secret was discovered, that regard must be had, not to its simple words, not to the construction of it by all Scotch lawyers, by the Courts of Law, by the Church, and by the people, *but*, to a construction of it by the *sup-*



*posed designs* of the Bolingbroke administration—*supposed* designs, we say, for, confessedly, even *they* did not venture to avow them, much less to state them in this act of Parliament !

But why enlarge on this subject ? That design of Lord Bolingbroke, has now effectually been accomplished, chiefly by the agency of Lord Brougham—strange and ominous conjuncture ! Why enlarge on the subject ? Because it is well, that the historical fact should be deeply impressed on the minds of Scotsmen, that their Church was overthrown not fairly, not legally, not justly ; but by a perversion of law, and by partizan judges ; that the Free Church Clergy did not secede because they wanted to establish new principles, but because they would not surrender old ones—because they would not agree to, allow an unprecedented interpretation of the Act of Queen Anne, to deprive the people, of rights, which were solemnly guaranteed to them, by the Revolution Settlement, and by the Act of Union.

But the work is done ! Having seen to it that our cause is just, and that we have fallen without reproach, having therefore the conscience clear, let us now, “*go forward.*” It is well to be *fully* satisfied that we were right in the recent struggle ; it is now well to acknowledge God’s hand in our deliverance from the bondage which would have afflicted us, had the holy Ministers of our Church failed in their duty. We are unendowed, but we are free. We are untrammelled by state interference ; no pastoral relationship can now be instituted without the consent of the people ; the days of intrusions, and of riding commissions, are over ; no more can Civil Courts interfere with our ordination, our Church censures, our Sacraments ; we have no head but the King of Kings, and no leader but Him, who is set forth as the only true and faithful “*Leader and Commander of His people.*” May He now be with us, bless us, keep us, and strengthen us ; may He give to all who go not with us, grace to see, “*eye to eye*” with us, or if not, may He pardon them where they err, and guide them where they go astray, and finally may He make our Church a blessing to the whole world and the glory of our Native land !

A. B.

## V.—THE FREE CHURCH AT HOME.

*(From the Madras Native Herald.)*

[The last number of this Christian periodical is now before us. It contains a spiritual and effective article entitled "The character and Progress of the Free Church movement in Scotland;" which consists chiefly of a series of extracts from private letters of pious correspondents in that country. There is no new presentation of facts;—but there is a sweet freshness in the hearty and honest declaration of individual feeling shewn in those fragments of correspondence, which attaches us more to the men of the movement, than the strongest reasoning or the clearest argumentation could do. We extract that portion of the article which relates chiefly to one feature of the case on which as yet we have not had opportunity to dwell—the amazing and increased demand for the preaching of the gospel, now manifested in Scotland—as also the great and self-denying efforts made by our Ministers and preachers to supply so blessed a demand. Where there is much thirst for the gospel, the SPIRIT OF GOD is manifesting his present power: where there is much preaching of the gospel, JESUS CHRIST is manifesting his present grace: and where CHRIST and the SPIRIT are, there is a present GOD: and "if God be for us, who can be against us?"]

The doings of the "Free Assembly" have already been laid before our readers and need not now be dwelt on. In its immediate effects the Disruption—as far as already reported on—has tended to the furtherance of the Gospel at home to an extent quite unprecedented. It was an interesting fact stated by one of the ablest champions of the cause in Glasgow that never since Scotland was a nation—never since the Reformation when the Church of Scotland was established—had the pure Evangel of Jesus Christ been preached to so great a number of immortal souls in all parts of Scotland as during the three or four Sabbaths immediately after the Disruption. This statement was made by a Minister—a standard-bearer in Israel—whose mind and eye were able to take in the whole field. It is a solemn encouraging fact that the crash of our venerable establishment should have awakened so many careless souls and compelled them, as it were, to hear and to thirst after the Gospel.

Nor is this extraordinary thirst to hear the word of God the effect of present excitement. The rough outline of the work so ably sketched in the February Circular, given above, is rapidly filling up. *Seven hundred and eighty* Congregations have already been organized, and others are in the process of formation, through the indefatigable exertions of the "Free Church's," *four hundred and seventy* Ministers and *two hundred* Licentiates. Her Elders and devoted people—amounting nearly to a million—have formed *seven hundred and seventy-eight* Associations for advancing her interests. About £80,000 per annum has been raised for the support of her Ministers and Preachers, and nearly £220,000 have been collected towards the erection of 600 places of worship before the winter sets in; £300,000 at the least being required. The new places of worship, through the extraordinary zeal of the common people of Scotland, giving their money, and in many places after their daily hours of work assisting with free labour, the munificent aid of the Marquis of Breadalbane and some other landed proprietors, and the generous contributions of Christians and Christian churches from all parts of the world, giving their hearts, and their prayers with their money, are

rising up in all directions—and even in districts intensely moderate—to the joy of those who have laboured so ardently and long that a scriptural and living Christianity may pervade and thoroughly impregnate every parish in Scotland.

As a specimen of the way in which the heaven is working in Scotland we again quote from our last correspondent:

"You have learned the wonderful success which has attended the efforts of the friends of the Free Church, in all parts of the country. In Ayrshire, we have succeeded beyond our most sanguine expectations. The way was prepared in some measure by the deputations from the Convocation in January and February last. I was associated with Dr. H. of Glasgow and Mr. D. of Dunlop, in visiting Carrick at that time: and we were greatly delighted with the interest manifested by the people in our cause in most of the parishes in that district. Several lectures were delivered in Ayr previous to the Disruption: and prayer-meetings were held every night during the sitting of Assembly. The great majority of my congregation—more than two-thirds—have left the establishment. But we do not yet know our full strength: as we meet on Sabbath in the Independent Chapel, which is too small to contain those who wish to attend. I preached for the last time in the parish church on the evening of Sabbath the 28th of May, to the most crowded congregation I ever addressed. My text was Hebrews xiii. 13. "Let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." It was a trying occasion. On Tuesday the 6th of June, we removed from the manse to the house we now occupy. The foundation-stone of our new Church was laid on the 25th of July. It is about fifty yards distant from the old Church on the same side of the street. It is to contain 1050 sittings: and to be finished at the end of November. Mr. G—— and his congregation have also been deprived of their Church by an interdict procured by Dr. ——. They are about to erect another. My new colleague, is an excellent person. The greater part of his congregation follow him. They are worshipping at present in Mr. H ——'s Church (Reformed Presbyterian): I go to a country parish every Sabbath evening to preach: generally to T——: where we expect to form a "Free Church" congregation. Churches are building at Dundonald, Stair, and Mauchline—Moderate parishes—and we hope to have congregations in Muirkirk, Ochiltree, Troon, &c. where the Ministers remain in the establishment. We have much more cause to sing of mercy than of judgment. The Lord is now working a great work in our land. Every where the people are anxious to hear the Gospel. And doors of usefulness are now opened, which were formerly closed against us.

"We are not forgetful of the foreign field though so much requires to be done at home. The collection for the Jewish scheme in June was unusually liberal. We are much encouraged by knowing that all the Missionaries are with us. Dr. Wilson has given in his adherence to the "Free Church." The Moderates have been laying claim to Dr. Puff. But we confidently anticipate the adherence of every Missionary of the General Assembly, whether to Gentiles or Jews. The Lord has lately taken to himself some who were "the chariots and horsemen" of our Israel. I refer particularly to Mr. McCheyne of Dundee (one of our Church's deputation to Palestine) and Mr. Robert Wodrow, both of whom were well known to me. I attended Mr. Wodrow's funeral: and saw a Jew weeping at his grave. He had the high honour of originating the scheme (of our Church) for the conversion of the Jews."

These extracts deal with realities that all Christians can appreciate, and indicate a calmness and steady determination in the prosecution of the great work to which our Church is at present called, highly fitted to animate

and to edify all the friends of true religion, and to stop the mouths of gainsayers.

The present is a sifting and winnowing time for the Church. "I am come," said our Lord, "to send fire on the earth; and what will I if it be already kindled?" This prediction is now receiving a fresh exemplification in Scotland. The subjoined extract from a private letter to another of the Missionaries of the Free Church at Madras, dated 25th August, gives this as one of the features of the present movement. His letter also supplies some further glimpses of its character and depth as now working in the hearts of the people of Scotland. At the call of Christ and of conscience this young Minister of the Gospel, like many of his brethren, gave up a beautiful agricultural parish in one of the richest districts of Scotland where he had been settled scarcely two years, and is now cut off from a parish on whose spiritual cultivation he had wholly set his heart.

"My dear Friend," he writes "I received your acceptable letter, just as I was setting out from home to attend the General Assembly. Great events have transpired since you wrote. And I believe they will not bulk the less largely in your eye because of the distance betwixt you and the arena. For the persons immediately concerned are often not so deeply impressed till the excitement and busy engrossment are over. There is however much—very much to impress even us. We have been led by a way which we knew not. The Lord our God has been working for us, and been commanding deliverances. Every new day is bringing with it new proofs that He has indeed arisen to plead His own cause. In every part of the country there is a growing intensity of desire to hear the glad tidings of great joy. The thirst for the Gospel is quite marvellous. The deep earnestness of our congregations—especially at communions—tells of a present God. And when one contrasts this with the former widely-spread deadness, it seems almost inexplicable—that any who have the least spiritual discernment should fail to discover that the "Free Church" has been stamped with the impress of the Divine approval. The Shechinah, encircling the mercy-seat, did not more unequivocally proclaim to ancient Israel that Jehovah was amongst them.

"Nor is it only here that the blessing will be felt. It will reach the plains of India. Dr. KERR remarked in our Assembly, that in writing to one of our Jewish Missionaries, as to the time of setting out on a particular Missionary tour which he had had in contemplation, he had advised him to go as soon as might be after the 18th of May, because he felt that he would not go *then* without a blessing. I liked the remark. And I doubt not that you have already realized its truth. The Lord is blessing His witnessing Church at home. Will not He bless her abroad too? Will not He give new power to the preached word in her? It was thus in apostolic times. "When the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul," then "with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus" (Acts iv. 32, 33) So is it now. The brethren have been made to dwell together in blessed unity. They have, as of old, been taught this lesson by persecution. They have been driven in, as it were, upon God. They have been made to feel that vain is the help of man. They have been constrained, almost in spite of themselves, to commit their way unto the Lord. Near to him, they are not far from one another. And the issue of this two-fold nearness is the glorious work which the Spirit is carrying on by them. The Son will be honoured every-where, abroad as well as at home. The "Free Church" will be made a blessing.

"But the world is growing proportionately angry. We are beginning to learn the meaning of our blessed Lord's declaration when He warned the disciples that He had come not to send peace on earth but a sword (Matth.

x. 34.) Friendships, old acquaintanceships,—are being broken up, because the conviction is forcing itself on all that friendship with the world is enmity with God. Both sides admit it—by a sort of tacit consent. You can scarcely conceive the magnitude of the change which this question is working in society. Families are divided. In many cases parental authority is exerted to deter and intimidate into an adherence to the old *effete* establishment. A man's foes are those of his own household.—And is it not well after all that it should be so? For a long while in this country, there has been such an amalgamation of merely professing with real Christians that the ungodly world could scarcely discern the difference. It saw only the faint feeble traces of God's image on the Church. And therefore it did not deem it worth its while to bestir itself. But it is otherwise now. And surely its wrath the Lord is making to praise Him for His people can be no longer lukewarm. Those who are on the Lord's side at all must stand there firmly and decidedly. May grace be given to us all to stand in this our time of need! \* \* \* \* \*

The harvest is plenteous; but the labourers are very few. Most of us are preaching *three or four* days a week, besides *three times* generally on the Sabbath. We are feeling that there is a great work for us to do, but that there is not much time to do it in. The present is a day of most merciful visitation to Scotland. It might have been far otherwise. The Lord might justly have taken our candlestick out of its place. But He spurs us still. He is lengthening out our day of grace. He is abroad just now gathering in His own. Oh! how well that we be hiding ourselves in the secret of His tabernacle! For every thing seems to portend that a dark night is coming—who knows how near?"

## VI.—FRAGMENT FROM RUTHERFORD.

[We heartily commend to our readers the perusal of the following extract from good old SAMUEL RUTHERFORD;—and dated from his Prison in Aberdeen, 1637, where he was long a prisoner for the Lord's sake. The passage is nowise controversial; but it shows now those men of God lived, who of old "contended for the Faith once delivered to the Saints." If we cannot suffer for Christ, it is because we do not believe; and if we do not believe, it is because our hearts are of the world, worldly. This kind cometh not out, but by prayer and fasting.]"

TO JOHN FLEMING, BAILLIE OF LEITH.

Worthy, and dearly Beloved in the Lord,

Grace, mercy, and peace be unto you—I received your letter. I wish that I could satisfy your desire, in drawing up, and framing for you a Christian directory; but the learned have done it before me, more judiciously than I can; especially Mr. Rodgers, Greenham, and Perkins: notwithstanding, I shall shew you what I would have been at, myself; howbeit I came always short of my purpose.

1. That hours of the days, less or more time, for the word and prayer, be given to God, not sparing the twelfth hour, or mid-day, howbeit it should then be the shorter time.

2. In the midst of worldly employments, there should be some thoughts of sin, death, judgment, and eternity, with, at least, a word or two of ejaculatory prayer to God.

3. To beware of wandering of heart in private prayers.

4. Not to grudge, howbeit ye came from prayer without sense of joy :— down-casting, sense of guiltiness, and hunger, are often best for us.

5. That the Lord's day, from morning to night, be spent always either in private or public worship.

6. That words be observed, wandering and idle thoughts be avoided, sudden anger and desire of revenge, even of such as persecute the truth, be guarded against ; for we often mix our zeal with our wild-fire.

7. That known, discovered, and revealed sins, that are against the conscience, be eschewed, as most dangerous preparatives to hardness of heart

8. That in dealing with men, faith and truth in covenants and trafficking be regarded, that we deal with all men in sincerity ; that conscience be made of idle and lying words ; and that our carriage be such, as that they who see it, may speak honorably of our sweet Master and profession.

9. I have been much self-challenged : 1. For not referring all to God, as the last end ; that I do not eat, drink, sleep, journey, speak, and think for God. 2. That I have not benefited by good company ; and that I left not some word of conviction, even upon natural and wicked men, as by reproving swearing in them, or because of being a silent witness to their loose carriage, and because I intended not in all companies to do good. 3. That the woes and calamities of the Kirk, and of particular professors, have not moved me. 4. That at the reading of the life of David, Paul, and the like, when it humbled me, I, (coming so far short of their holiness,) laboured not to imitate them, afar off at least, according to the measure of God's grace. 5. That unrepented sins of youth were not looked to, and lamented for. 6. That sudden stirrings of pride, lust, revenge, love of honours, were not resisted and mourned for. 7. That my charity was cold. 8. That the experiences I had, of God's hearing me in this and the other particular, being gathered, yet in a new trouble I had always, (once at least,) my faith to seek, as if I were to begin at A B C again. 9. That I have not more boldly contradicted the enemies, speaking against the truth, either in public church-meetings or at tables, or ordinary conference. 10. That in great troubles, I have received false reports of Christ's love, and misbelieved him in his chastening ; whereas the event hath said, " All was in mercy." 11. Nothing more moveth me, and weighteth my soul, than that I could never for my heart, in my prosperity, so wrestle in prayer with God, nor be so dead to the world, so hungry and full of love for Christ, so heavenly-minded, as when ten stone-weight of a heavy cross was upon me. 12. That the cross extorted vows of new obedience, which ease hath blown away, as chaff before the wind. 13. That practice was so short and narrow, and light so long and broad. 14. That death hath not been often meditated upon. 15. That I have not been careful of gaining others to Christ. 16. That my grace and gifts bring forth little or no thankfulness.

There are some things, also, whereby I have been, helped : as,—1. I have benefited by riding alone a long journey, in giving that time to prayer. 2. By abstinence, and giving days to God. 3. By praying for others ; for by making an errand to God for them, I have gotten something for myself. 4. I have been really confirmed, in many particulars, that God heareth prayers ; and, therefore, I used to pray for anything, of how little importance soever. 5. He enabled me to make no question, that this mocked way, which is nicknamed, is the only way to Heaven.

Sir, these, and many more occurrences in your life, should be looked unto : and,—1. Thoughts of atheism should be watched over, as, If there be a God in Heaven ; which will trouble and assault the best, at some times. 2. Growth in grace should be cared for, above all things : and falling from our first love mourned for. 3. Conscience made of praying for the enemies, who are blinded.

## VII.—LOCAL RETROSPECT.

### *Review of the last three Months.*

Three months have now elapsed since the first meeting of the FREE CHURCH congregation, in Calcutta—Lord's day, August 13th, 1843 : and we deem it good for ourselves, as it may also be interesting to our friends, even at the risk of repetition, to take a brief retrospect of that short, but probably most critical, portion of our existence—our ecclesiastical *infancy*.

On the Missiary Ministers of the Church of Scotland devolved the privilege of first moving in this great and honourable cause : a circumstance which arose from their peculiar relationship to the Church at home, and their official relationship to the Branch Church of the establishment in Calcutta. As Missionaries, they had received communications from the two Bodies at home—so that apart from their previous decision in private judgment, they were laid under an official necessity to declare on which side they intended to act ; and their decision was immediate and unanimous for the Free Church, as the real spiritual representative of that Church which had ordained and supported them. As Ruling Elders also in the Branch Church, three of their number requested a meeting for the discussion of the Kirk-Session's duty in this solemn crisis—the meeting was peremptorily refused by the Moderator, and in such terms as to leave no doubt as to the course which the Ministry of St. Andrew's Kirk meant to pursue : and so as Elders also, the Missionary brethren were compelled to demit their connexion with the Calcutta Scottish Establishment.

After earnest prayer and deliberation, the Brethren determined to adopt measures for laying the Foundation of a FREE CHURCH, instead of that which they had left ; that the name and glory of CHRIST as sole Head of his Church might be upheld—and to provide the more public means of grace for the benefit of those who might be like-minded with them on this important subject. They therefore formed themselves into a "Provisional Committee" ; and having been kindly favoured with the temporary use of the "Free Masons' Hall," they gave public intimation, only a day or two before hand, that Public Worship would be held there on the following Lord's-day. Up till the day of meeting they knew not who might join them, save their

own families, and two or three private friends with whose minds they were of course acquainted. They could not tell whether ten or twenty, more or fewer, might come together, to strengthen them :—for they had used no means of any sort, even so much as to ascertain who might become adherents, or who not.

The assembly on the morning of the 13th August, was large beyond their expectation ;—and although there were not a few present from curiosity, or other motives besides that of adherency, still the appearance was most encouraging to those who had hitherto acted on their own sole responsibility, and it gave promise of a result in which they have not yet been disappointed. On that day too, was added to the Church, by public baptism before the congregation, a Native Christian convert, long a Pupil of the Missionary Institution—as if it were the Lord's will to identify the Church and the Mission from the beginning. To HIM be thanks for all His kindness to His unworthy servants and people !

On the 24th August, a meeting of adherents was held at the Mechanics' Institute—when several resolutions were adopted for consolidating the interests of the newly formed Free Church congregation. It was unanimously agreed, that a subscription fund be opened for the erection of a Place of Worship, and that a special committee be appointed for the purpose of accomplishing this object. It was also agreed that the Revd. Dr. Duff, the Senior Missionary, be requested to give a series of lectures on the subject of the Free Church Secession—as no means had yet been employed for enlightening the public mind on that subject, in Calcutta. The proposal also made, that the usual ministrations of public worship should be for the present conducted by the Revd. J. Macdonald, with occasional aid from his Missionary brethren, and without relinquishment of his Missionary work, was also unanimously agreed to. All was decision, and all was harmony.

In the course of three weeks the congregation were constrained to withdraw from the "Free Masons' Hall," under circumstances to which it is unnecessary here to advert, and assembled in the Hall of the Parental Academic Institution, which had been kindly and readily placed at their service. Here they have continued, in much comfort, and with sincere thankfulness, to assemble, on every Lord's day since that period ; and they have felt the presence of the Lord with them, in the midst of what may be regarded by many as external privation, or even as ecclesiastical degradation. Considerable expence has been cheerfully incurred in fitting up the Hall in the most commodious manner for the comfort of those who attend—so that now they feel ecclesiastically domesticated, until they shall be able to have a new and special Church of their own.

The Fund for the Building Expences has gone on satisfactorily, amounting as it now does to Rs. 14,500 :—to which may be added the monthly subscription Fund of about Rs. 200, or Rs. 2,400 per annum. It may also be stated that the good old Scottish custom of receiving smaller sums at the Church door, has also been revived



—and that the collecting box has rendered since the middle of September its Rs. 240. These are some indications of the interest felt from within, or of the sympathy manifested from without :—and together they encourage those on whom rests the chief responsibility of acting as to the ultimate result. Yet, truly, that result is not small, when considered with minute contemplation : a site must be purchased, at no small price ;—a commodious edifice must be erected ;—which together cannot be effected under Rs. 30,000 :—a gospel Minister must be procured from home, and a proper sustenance for him be secured—and this chiefly by a handful of people. What has been done, is an occasion of thanksgiving and a ground of encouragement : what remains to be done, is a trial of faith, and a stimulus to still greater and greater exertion.

The Free Church Mission has not been overlooked. A local committee has been formed to manage its financial concerns—that is, in other words, to obtain needful Funds. The amount of subscriptions advertised is nearly Rs. 4,700 : to which must be added the monthly list, to the amount of Rs. 500, or Rs. 6,000 per annum—in all prospectively about Rs. 11,000. The whole sum required to maintain the Mission in its former effective state of operation will be upwards of Rs. 20,000—and if new premises must be procured, much more will be needed : but surely it is a source of much consolation to find, that the claims of this spiritual crisis have been so spontaneously acknowledged, nay we might even say, cheerfully welcomed, by so many of our fellow-Christians, not of one, but of various denominations. We cannot expect this feeling always to last :—but proof has been given that there is some latent life, that there are some hidden sympathies, to work upon in India, when a crisis of claims arrives.

Nor can we overlook this amount of *Catholic* attention and kindness which the Free Church cause in this place has received. The principle really involved in it is not *sectarian*, whatever unwilling men may choose to say, or profess to think. It is purely spiritual—involving our ecclesiastical Christianity :—it belongs to the Church, as the Church of Christ, versus the powers of the earth—and is therefore most catholic in its import and ultimate bearings. If it affect the present interest of one Christian community, it has been felt already in some former case, and will yet be more largely realized in a third. Besides, principle, conscience, consistency, are ever things of catholic interest—and may draw forth the kind sympathies and regards of those who yet differ as to the immediate point of struggle and sacrifice. A sense too of natural justice, and a perception of civil or judicial wrong, even in cases of very opposite opinions as to the real merits of the case, do of themselves often excite attention and draw forth tokens of feeling, as encouraging on the one side, as they are painful and disagreeable on the other. Many proofs of such Catholicity, both spiritual and instinctive, have been given on the present crisis :—nor has even professional sympathy been withheld. A Christian Barrister, entirely unconnected with the Presbyterian Church,

save by faith and love, has published a Pamphlet, entitled "*The Law of Patronage and the Recent Secession*"; in which may be seen, how, on the mind of an able professional man, possessed of a candid and enquiring mind, the impression has been forced, that the **FREE CHURCH** cause is right in law and equity, as well as we hold it to be so in Scripture and Christianity. Mr. Wylie's Tract is a valuable accession, both as an instrument of professional defence, and a trophy of honest disinterested conviction; and being a local production, must not be overlooked by our Indian friends.

Dr. Duff's able and effective series of lectures, now publishing in our pages, form the last, but not the least, object of our present brief retrospect. These lectures sweep the whole horizon of this cause, viewed in its bearings, scriptural, historical, and practical. They were of course popular in their character; and were attentively listened to by a large and respectable audience: we know that they have done good—and we doubt not they will effect more in a published form. They will speedily be published in a separate volume: and may then be as a useful manual in the hands of all our friends—as well as presented to the attention of our more candid opponents.

Thus, in all points in which we needed help, has the Lord hitherto helped us. Let us not walk unworthily of such mercy, so manifold and so great. If we honour Him, there is much yet in which he may help and encourage us—if we forget Him, there is much in which He may chasten and humble us. "Delight thyself in the Lord, and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart: commit thy way unto the Lord—trust also in Him—and He shall bring it to pass: and He shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noon-day!"

# BENGAL MISSION OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

The Missionaries conducting the Scottish Mission in Bengal, having joined in the Secession from the Established Church of Scotland, a Committee has been formed, consisting partly of those who have also joined in that Secession and partly of others, who are connected with them solely by bonds of Christian sympathy, for the purpose of securing the continuance and future efficiency and extension of the Mission.

The members of the Committee, in addition to the five Scottish Missionaries in Calcutta, namely the Revd. Dr. Duff, the Revd. W. S. Mackay, the Revd. D. Ewart, the Revd. J. Macdonald, and the Revd. T. Smith, are as follows:—

Simon Nicolson, Esq.

Macleod Wylie, Esq.

J. A. F. Hawkins, Esq.

J. Calder Stewart, Esq.

Robert Williams, Esq.

J. Buchanan, Esq.

At a Meeting of the Committee thus constituted, held September 29th, 1843, it was unanimously resolved:

1. That the principles, the objects, and the success of the Scottish Mission, appear to this Committee, to warrant the most cheering expectations, that, with the blessing of the Lord, it will prove a powerful agent for good in this benighted land; and that former benefits which have been derived from it, as well as the prospect of its future usefulness, impose a duty on all who are anxious for the spread of the Gospel, to succour and extend it.

2. That this Committee rejoice to hear, that it has been declared by the Church to which the Missionaries are now attached, that they desire to carry on and to increase their present Missionary operations.

3. That this Committee is of opinion, that an appeal for the purpose of raising funds to carry out this design, can be made nowhere so appropriately as in this country, where the nature and results of the Scottish Mission are most accurately known, and where its benefits have been imparted; and that a subscription be therefore opened, to assist its future maintenance, and to further its extension.

4. That this Committee, considering that under the terms of the interim arrangement lately made between the Missionaries, and the Calcutta corresponding Board of the Established Church, with which they were recently in connection, the whole support of the Mission must, very soon, be derived through this Committee, (from funds contributed to the purpose in Great Britain and in India,) and not, as heretofore, through the abovementioned Board;—and that, therefore, provision ought to be made, to meet the necessarily large current expenses of so extensive a Mission, from the early date when that arrangement will terminate; and also considering their prospect, of still further increasing the Mission, and the necessity of providing for the purchase of the present Institution, (which by law belongs to the Established Church,) or for the erection and furniture, or for the rent and furniture of another building—do, on these grounds, make an earnest appeal to all of every Church, who desire to promote the glory of their Lord in this land, and to extend his Kingdom, to come forward and help them with liberal donations and permanent periodical subscriptions.

Donations and Subscriptions already received:

DONATIONS.		SUBSCRIPTIONS.			
Co.'s Rs.		Co.'s Rs.	per month.		
Simon Nicolson, Esq., . . . . .	1,000	George Dougal, Esq., . . . . .	150	J. W. Alexander, Esq., . . . . .	100
C. Tucker, Esq., . . . . .	250	E. Grey, Esq., . . . . .	20	J. A. F. Hawkins, Esq., . . . . .	100
R. Trotter, Esq., . . . . .	500	G. Udny, Esq., . . . . .	50	C. Tucker, Esq., . . . . .	10
G. J. Gordon, Esq., . . . . .	200	P. Friell, Esq., . . . . .	100	C. J. Richards, Esq., . . . . .	10
C. J. Richards, Esq., . . . . .	100	H. McEwen, Esq., . . . . .	100	Captain Roxburgh, . . . . .	10
Revd. T. Boaz, . . . . .	50	J. Allan, Esq., . . . . .	250	J. Norman, Esq., . . . . .	10
Dr. Logan, . . . . .	100	J. Lewis, Esq., . . . . .	100	R. Williams, Esq., . . . . .	30
E. Edmond, Esq., . . . . .	60	W. G. Rose, Esq., . . . . .	100	M. Wylie, Esq. per an-	
J. Calder Stewart, Esq., . . . . .	100	A. Speirs, Esq., . . . . .	300	num, . . . . .	20
D. F. Macleod, Esq., . . . . .	200	G. F. Brown, Esq., . . . . .	50	Dr. D. Stewart, per ditto	50
Dr. Butler, . . . . .	50	J. Brown, Esq., . . . . .	50	J. Buchanan, Esq., ditto	50
J. W. Gordon, Esq., . . . . .	50	C. S. L., . . . . .	25	Dr. Webster, per anum	50
A Friend, . . . . .	25	A Friend, . . . . .	300	Dr. Leckie, ditto, . . . . .	50
Dr. D. Stewart, . . . . .	100	P. G., . . . . .	50	J. Allan, Esq. per month	10
D. B., . . . . .	100	<i>American Missionaries at</i>		G. F. Edmonstone, Esq. do.	10
Captain Roxburgh, . . . . .	50	<i>Loolianah.</i>			
A Friend (R. B.) . . . . .	100	Revd. J. R. Campbell, . . . . .	20		
N. B. E. Baillie, Esq., . . . . .	250	Revd. J. Craig, . . . . .	20		
Dr. Duncan, . . . . .	50	Revd. J. Caldwell, . . . . .	20		
D. McCallum, Esq., . . . . .	100	Revd. L. Jauvier, . . . . .	20		
Robert Smith, Esq., . . . . .	100				

THE

# FREE CHURCHMAN.

---

VOL. I.]      THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1843.      [No. 6.

---

I.—LECTURES EXPOSITORY OF THE PRINCIPLES,—THE MAINTENANCE OF WHICH HAS LED TO THE RECENT DISRUPTION OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, AND THE CONSEQUENT FORMATION OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

---

LECTURE IV.—THE SOLE AND SUPREME HEADSHIP OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST OVER THE CHURCH.—*About the commencement of the present century, the Church began to emerge from the dark and dreary night of Moderate Ascendancy—Causes which aided the revival—Dr. Thomson's Anti-Patronage Society—The era of Reform—Summary of opinions and reasonings relative to the Abolition of Patronage—Summary of opinions and reasonings relative to the revival of the Church's still existing but long dormant powers, with a view to the mitigation of the evils of Patronage—This led to the Passing of the famous Veto Act of 1834—Its happy and glorious effects—Its real character described—The precise nature, aim, and bearing of the first Auchterarder case—A series of encroachments, on the part of the Court of Session, which completely destroyed the remaining rights and liberties of the people, and laid the independent spiritual jurisdiction of the Church prostrate in the dust—The unprecedented Erastianism of the second Auchterarder case—These decisions shewn to be as contrary to Statute Law, and Acts of Security, and Treaties of Union, as they were palpably contrary to the word of God, and the Standards of the Church—Involving as they did a gross violation of the Constitutional Law of the Land, not less than OF THE SOLE AND SUPREME HEADSHIP OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST OVER THE CHURCH, a final appeal is presented to the Supreme Legislature for a redress of grievances—The righteous appeal conclusively negatived—Consequent determination of the faithful majority to sever their connection with the State and its now degraded, Erastianized Establishment—Proceedings of the ever-memorable 18th May, 1843, by which a noble and unsurpassed testimony was lifted up in behalf of the prerogatives of the Lord Jesus Christ, as Sole Head of the Church and only King in Zion—Concluding appeal to four classes of hearers—The uninquiring and indifferent—Christians of different denominations—Adherents to the now Erastianized Establishment of Scotland—Adherents to the Free Church of Scotland.*

About the commencement of the present century, the Church of Scotland—stirred up by the volcanic burst of Atheism in Revolutionary France, the aggressive movements of Wesleyanism, the rousing appeals

of the earlier Missionary Societies in England, and other local causes,—began slowly to emerge into light and life, from her dark and middle age—the age of blight and barrenness under the withering frown of Moderate ascendancy—the age, during which almost all “life had died, and death itself lived.” The rise of this dawning epoch was signalized by at least one very remarkable revival of religion—the scene of which lay in the parish of Moulin, and district of Athole, in the heart of the Grampians—and the savour of which has been perpetuated to this day. By degrees, at first almost imperceptible, the faithful protesting minority in the Church continued to increase. As fresh accessions were made to their number, they were enheartened and emboldened. More vigorous inquiries began to be instituted into the good old, but long forsaken paths; while the voice of a reviving and energetic evangelism made itself heard in increasingly louder and more authoritative tones in the annual Assemblies of the Church.

As the first quarter of the century was about to close, one of the greatest, and perhaps the stoutest, of the champions of truth in those days,—the late celebrated Dr. Andrew Thomson,—borne along by the spirit of the age, which he himself had helped so successfully to fan,—caught, as by prophetic glance, the shadows which coming events had cast before. A stranger to timid counsels, and a sworn foe to feeble and irresolute reforms, he at once, with the promptitude and vigour so characteristic of his noble leonine nature, organized a society for the express purpose of re-agitating the question of the total abolition of Lay-Patronage. By the Public Meetings, discussions, and publications of this Society,—which was denounced by some as fanatical in its object, by others as revolutionary, and by almost all as hopeless and vain—general attention was awakened, and a new and unwonted interest excited in principles, that had long been allowed to slumber in oblivion.

Then came the famous era of Reform. All Civil and Political Institutions were now subjected to a process of dissolution, preparatory to a process of renovation. It seemed as if an earthquake had passed over the land, and rent asunder the entire fabric of society. It seemed, for a while, as if, amid the wreck and ruin of things that were, one stood gazing at the shattered remnants of a primordial state of being:—as if one beheld, politically and socially, what the Poet beheld physically, when his eye caught a wildering scene of rifted and riven masses:—

“Craggs, rocks, and knolls, confus'dly hurl'd  
The fragments of an earlier world.”

But, if all was disjointed and pulled to pieces, it was only in order to be remodelled after a more perfect pattern. If all was indiscriminately thrown down, it was only in order to be rebuilt in improved and renovated forms.

As in former periods, sound reforms in the State came opportunely in aid of sound Reforms in the Church—so now. Men began naturally to ask, Why should not Patronage, which has been violently im-

posed on us, as an insufferable yoke, be now utterly abolished? Why bind us down to a former age in Ecclesiastical affairs, when we are broken loose from it in the social and political? Are we to make progress in all sorts of Reform except what concerns the Church? Have we succeeded in vindicating our rights and privileges as members of the Body Politic, and shall we not resolved to vindicate our rights and privileges as members of the Body Spiritual? Has all "civil and individual monopoly of power" been abolished; and shall not the patronate monopoly in the Church,—which is a remnant of feudal barbarism and Popish canon law, begun in fraud and secularity, and perpetuated by violence and robbery—degrading Christian citizens into serfs—and serving only to remind them, that they may be the descendants of ancestors who once were slaves—be abolished too? Shall we be invested with the responsible trust of electing our Legislators, and our Magistrates, and not our Pastors? Are we empowered to exercise a real voice in all Civil and Political affairs, and none in the Spiritual? While rights, connected with the former, have been freely conferred, are we to be defrauded of the most elementary rights connected with the latter? Are we to be politically and civilly liberated, and yet ecclesiastically enthralled? Shall we ourselves have the right to choose those who are to watch over our lives and property; and must it still be left to strangers and to aliens to choose for us, the spiritual shepherds that are to watch over the interests of the immortal soul? Is it to be deemed foul scorn to entrust the management and protection of our temporal concerns to the nominees of the Crown, or of Peers, or of wealthy Commoners; and shall we, and must we, still entrust the management and ordering of all our spiritual concerns to a similar arbitrary nomination? Shall the State be free, and Zion be in bondage? Shall the State be emancipated; and the Church, which is the first kingdom and freest Commonwealth on earth, be enslaved? May every society, civil, social and political, now elect its own office-bearers; and shall the Church, which is a purely spiritual society united by spiritual bonds, for the attainment of spiritual ends, have no control in the election of its own office-bearers? Must its highest spiritual functionaries, on whose character and qualifications, its prosperity so essentially depends, be still chosen, not by men of faith and spiritual discernment, but by worldlings who practically deny every one of the peculiar principles of the gospel—or, by Socinians, who rob it of its chiefest glory—or, by infidels, who treat the whole as cant, folly, and hypocrisy?—Is there not something in all this, strangely anomalistic and irrational?

Others, satisfied with a direct, plain, matter-of-fact view of the subject, argued somehow as follows:—What would be thought of a Legislative enactment, which empowered a Patron to lay violent hands on an individual man, and compel him by main force against his will and conscientious conviction, to listen Sabbath after Sabbath, and year after year, to an obnoxious and unedifying ministry? And "is not a Christian congregation a creature, a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, just as much as a Christian man—having interests, duties, and rights

of which it is not less a sacrilege to despoil them?" But the people, it was replied, are not literally compelled to attend. What of that?—was the prompt and obvious response. In most instances, there is practically no alternative, but that the people should attend such a ministry as that now described, or none at all. In other words, the Law of unmitigated Patronage practically places the masses of the people in the fearful predicament of being compelled to exist without enjoying the means and ordinances of grace at all, with their refreshing supplies of the bread of life and the water of life—or, of attending on the forms and semblances of these, to be gradually famished on the garbage of the desert, instead of being fed with "the milk and honey" of the Promised Land. And was this a state of things which reason, justice, or common sense, could any longer tolerate?

Even the old Seceders, headed by the celebrated Ecclesiastical Historian Dr. McCrie, were roused in defence of the righteous claims of the Church. In an elaborate statement put forth by them, they argued thus:—"The State," said they, "has no more right to elect the Pastors of the Church, than the Church to elect the rulers of the State. How would it be tolerated, were the General Assembly to assume the power of nominating any of the King's ministers, and officers of State? Or, were a foreign prince to claim a similar power, even though a veto should be left in the King's hand? And why should the Church, the freest Society on earth, the much loved and honoured spouse of Christ, whose liberties have been purchased by the blood of her Divine Head, and secured by the charter of Heaven, be subjected to a similar dictation on the part of the State? Is it because there is no King in the midst of her? Or, because it is thought that the rights of His kingdom may be more safely invaded and bartered away, than those of earthly sovereigns? Is it because the Legislature presumed that her watchmen were become blind and dumb? or that her citizens were now prepared to crouch to a yoke, which formerly "neither they nor their fathers were able to bear"? It is impossible that a Church can be truly free, so long as the initial appointment of her ministers is vested in a foreign power, over which she has no control—so long as her Pastors must seek admission into her pulpits, and her people must submit to receive them at the hands of persons who may not only be aliens to the Church, but her avowed enemies, infidels, or profligates."

Others, assuming ground still higher, because more spiritual and direct, felt morally indignant at the Law of Patronage, because of its interference with the Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ. But how, it may be asked, does it so interfere?—The way may be briefly stated. It interferes with the Supreme Headship and Kingship of Christ, inasmuch as it usurps his sole and exclusive prerogative as the Lawgiver of his spiritual Kingdom or Church. Who made a law which, like that of Patronage, so materially affects his honour, and the interests of his people? Was it himself? No. Was it any of his inspired Apostles? No. Was it any of his ministers, acting entirely in accordance with his mind, and revealed will? No.

By whom, then, has it been enacted? Solely by the powers of this world—for worldly ends—and the promotion of carnal policy! And is not the imposition of such a law, by the foreign powers of earth, a plain and undisguised invasion of his spiritual kingdom—a plain and undoubted infringement of his royal authority? Or, again, it interferes with the Supreme Headship of Christ, inasmuch as it clearly subverts the liberties of his ministers and people. For if Christ be sole Head and King, then, plainly must his members and subjects be free to serve him alone. Thus, the Headship of Christ and the liberties of his people are correlative—the one necessarily involving the other. Invade or usurp the one, and the other is, by that very act, usurped or invaded too. Christ is Head *over* all things *to* the Church, whether they *willingly* submit to him or not. But he is Head *of* the Church in a peculiar and endearing sense. He is Head of it as His own Body—a Body, actuated and animated in all its members by his free spirit,—a Body, cheerfully yielding a voluntary submission to his sovereign will in all things—a Body, therefore, clearly exempted, by its very nature and constitution, from the despotism of foreign control, in any or all of its varied actings. Consequently, the Patronage Act, by robbing the members of the body of an important portion of their liberty in Christ, the Head—that liberty, which constitutes at once their privilege, and, spiritually, their very being—essentially interferes with his supremacy, as Sole Head and King.\*

When mixed and varied sentiments like the preceding became general;—when they pervaded the whole land—circulating in Newspapers, Journals, and Magazines—occupying the deliberations of the Senate—agitating the assemblies of the people,—and penetrating to every domestic circle;—things were fast ripening for change. A change, accordingly, was demanded. But what was to be done? The radical cure would be, the total abolition of the Patronage Act, and a reversion to the Revolution, or other prior Settlements. But this could only be done by the Imperial Parliament. For that Supreme Power which had imposed the grievous yoke could alone undo it. But how was *it* to be moved? The General Assemblies of the Church might agitate, discuss, protest, yea demand a repeal of the obnoxious Act, not in whispers merely, but in a voice of thunder. Still, the Parliament might hesitate—procrastinate—postpone indefinitely—under cover of the ten thousand ready devices and expedients of diplomatic policy. What, then, was to be done? Ultra Reformers were for extreme measures. The sinking party of the Moderates, true to their inherited principles, resisted any measures at all. While practical Reformers and the leading members of the Evangelical

\* To prevent misconception, it may be noted, that the preceding reasonings are not imaginary or hypothetical. They are a faithful and condensed epitome of reasons and arguments that were actually employed—as these have been gleaned from an extensive reference to the Newspaper discussions, speeches, and pamphlets of the day.



section of the Church now rapidly growing into a decided majority, resolved without delay to attempt the lesser good, when totally uncertain or hopeless of immediately securing the greater. Their leading views and sentiments may, perhaps, be briefly but not unfaithfully embodied, as follows :—

From the very origin of the Reformed Church of Scotland, nearly three centuries ago, (1560) Patronages and presentations to benefices, “as the barbarous terms themselves denote,” were denounced as “flowing from the Pope and corruption of the canon law only.” They were, accordingly, openly abjured and renounced by the Reformers and their successors. Neither at its first rise, nor at any subsequent period, were they ever allowed to enter into the constitution of the Church. „From her Confessions of Faith, and Standards of Government and Discipline, all recognition of them was carefully and systematically excluded. The Church being a society of the professing disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ, it was, from the beginning, laid down as an incontrovertible scriptural principle, that it ought to have the entire administration of its own internal affairs, and especially the selection and settlement of its chief office-bearers *within itself*—that, in some form or other, whether by way of direct election, or formal consent, or, at least, the sanction involved in the absence of all dissent, the people had a clear scriptural right to exercise a voice in the choice of a Pastor—that, as a necessary consequence, it was as unscriptural as it was irrational to force or intrude a Minister on any congregation against its will—and that, as a farther consequence still, Patronage was not only inexpedient and injurious in its tendency, but, in its very nature, a sinful encroachment alike on the rights of the Christian people and the spirituality, the freedom, and the independence of the Church,—and thereby, a plain invasion of the Royal prerogative of Christ, her Divine Head and King. Thus, from the very first, did a stern and implacable opposition to Patronage, and an equally stern and resolute maintenance of the principle of non-intrusion, constitute some of the most prominent and distinguishing features in the Polity and History of the Church of Scotland. The latter principle was registered in all her accredited Standards as a *fundamental* one—as a principle, therefore, never to be departed from ;—and it was so, because it was found first of all so registered in the infallible word of God, from which it was directly transferred to the standards of the Church. At different periods, Patronage was not only disowned by the Church, but entirely abolished by the State ; and full effect given to the principle of non-intrusion. These were the golden periods of the Church ;—when religion, piety, morality, and sound education most extensively flourished and abounded. At other periods, the Church, overborne by the force and pressure of external circumstances, was obliged more or less, to yield and keep her righteous claims in abeyance. But, if she appeared to submit, it was the involuntary submission of one, overpowered by superior force. If she appeared to acquiesce, it was the reluctant acquiescence of one, robbed by an arm of might that could not be resisted. If she appeared to

endure the re-imposition of Patronage, it was merely by *sufferance* during a season of helplessness. If she appeared to succumb to it, it was only as a yoke and grievance, to destroy which, not the will but the power was wanting. If she appeared to tolerate it, it was only as an abuse to be reformed or wholly removed, not a system to be cherished or even regulated. And lest her apparent toleration of it, under actual coercion, should be construed into any thing like a sanction, her faithful office-bearers never ceased, with one clear, constant and uninterrupted voice, from the dawn of the Reformation, till the year 1784, to protest against it, and condemn it, as a base usurpation on the part of the State, from which they prayed and toiled and struggled to be wholly delivered. And what they could not entirely remove, they strove, with all their might and main, to render as harmless as possible. This they were enabled to accomplish, in a greater or less degree, by a vigorous exercise of the spiritual powers still vested in the Church courts. According to their greater or less success in thus subserving the interests of vital religion, they regarded the age, as one of silver, or of brass, or of iron. And, after neutralizing, as far as in them lay, the mischievous effects of an odious yoke, they confidently looked forward to a return of the golden age, when, under the reviving smile of a gracious Providence, all old abuses would pass away, and all despoiled rights and privileges be happily restored. True, during the latter half of last century, there was a growing defection on the part of the Church from her own principles, and the spirit of her own constitution. But such temporary defection did not annihilate either. Even the more candid and sagacious of the leaders of the Moderates (such as Dr. Cook,) distinctly allow that, during that period, "too narrow a view of the rights and liberties of the Christian people had been taken by the governing party." But rights and liberties that have been neglected, or that have fallen into practical desuetude, through sinful indifference, are not thereby destroyed. These never were, and never can be, competently abrogated. Being founded on the word of God—the oracles of eternal truth—they are in their own nature unchanged and unchangeable. No length of neglect—no series of practical delinquencies connected therewith, can make that to be right, which, in its own essential nature, is morally and scripturally wrong;—or, in any way, cancel the obligation to assert and vindicate the right, whenever the power and the opportunity providentially recur. Seeing, then, that we cannot directly repeal the Patronage Act itself, let us resolve earnestly to seek for its ultimate abolition. And, in the mean while, let us revive and bring into exercise such powers as have been still left to us by the constitution, but which, through the criminal negligence of our predecessors, have long been held in abeyance. Let us revive and bring into active exercise such rights as we derive not merely from Scripture, but enjoy by the positive sanction of Statute Law, and which have only become obsolete in practice, after a dark and dreary age of apathy and indifference, during which, a race of faithless ministers abandoned the

assertion of their own inherent rights—allowed themselves to sink under a secular and political management—tolerated and enforced principles and practices, eversive alike of the doctrines of the gospel, and the liberties of its true disciples—suffered a high-handed Patronage to obtain an absolute and entire possession, which neither an alienated people, nor a slumbering Church cared any longer to contest. By Statutes that have never been rescinded or annulled,\* we have

\* Since the text was written, I have met with the following clear and unanswerable statement on this vitally important point by the Revd. Dr. Buchanan of Glasgow :—

“Let me state to you in what position the Church believed that she stood to that law, (1712) till the present year. You will observe that the Law of Patronage binds the Presbyteries of the Church to receive and admit qualified ministers presented by the Patrons. Now if the Church, when that law was passed, had imagined that they were to receive and admit any minister that the Patron chose to place before them,—if the Church had imagined that they were bound to take any man as qualified whom the Patron thought to be qualified, and that they were to put him into the Church of a particular parish, because the Patron directed them to do so, or because any Civil Court commanded them to do so, the Church never would have consented to be a Church in connection with the State under that law at all. And you will see how it was impossible for them to be connected with the State on such a condition. You must know well, for the Bible teaches it plainly that the Church, the Presbyteries of the Church, are commanded to “lay hands suddenly on no man.” They are commanded by the Lord Jesus Christ to commit the office which they hold “to faithful men.” This is Christ’s injunction to the members of Presbyteries. They must not proceed hastily about this grave matter, which requires to be gone about seriously, calmly, and deliberately. They must be satisfied that the individual is faithful, suited for the work in which he desires to be engaged, and not only having gifts for the ministry in general, but gifts for the particular parish to which he is appointed. This is the duty of the Presbytery, and which they dare not surrender into other hands. If they were to consent to put a man into the ministry, not because it is the will of Christ as revealed in his word, but because the Patron commands them, or because the Court of Session commands them to do so, they would manifestly be forsaking their allegiance to Christ, and choosing to obey man rather than God—they would be taking their orders from Cæsar in a matter which belongs to Christ: and they could not do such a thing without betraying their subjection to Christ their King. Well then, the question is, were they at liberty under that Law of Patronage to act with the freedom now described? Were they at liberty, when a Patron placed a man before them, to say, we consent to examine this man whether he has gifts for the ministry, and whether he has gifts for that parish; but if we are not satisfied, we will refuse to go on with the settlement? This was what the Presbyteries of the Church claimed under that Law of Patronage, and they conceived that there was nothing in that law, or in other laws of the Church, to deprive them of that liberty. And there were various reasons to justify them in supposing that they had liberty. In the first place, in the Act 1567, it is declared, that the examination and admission of ministers shall be only in the power of the Kirk. That was the law of the State recognizing the liberty of the Church in this matter; and that law continues in force till the present day. Then, another law was passed about twenty-five years after that, in 1592, by which it is said that the collation or deprivation of ministers,—that is, the setting of ministers in parishes, or the putting of ministers out of the sacred office,—that these powers are given by God to his Church, which the king’s authority cannot touch or interfere with. Then, again, at the Revolution Settlement, the law regarding the settlement of ministers, which was then made, was of this kind,—it stated that while the Kirk-Session of the parish, and the Protestant heritors, were to name the minis-

still the undisputed power and right to judge of every thing connected with the qualifications, the examination and the admission of candidates for the office of the Holy Ministry. We have still the undisputed power and right to inquire, not merely in the Literature, Life, and Doctrine of the presentee, but also to inquire into, ascertain, and insist on the essential *fact* of his acceptability or non-acceptability to the people among whom he is called to labour,—and thus, at least carry out our own grand and fundamental principle, “that no Pastor shall be intruded on any congregation against their will.” Thus, too,—by duly applying to the Civil Power for the abrogation of such laws as may affect the Church’s purity and abridge her freedom, while, at the same time, for the correction of existing abuses, we revive and vigorously employ all the long neglected means which still belong to us, not only as a spiritual and independent society under Christ its Sole Head, but also as an ecclesiastical body recognized and established by\* the

---

ter,—that is, to propose him, and bring him, as it were, before the Presbytery, then the Presbytery were to place the man before the people, that they might make trial of his gifts; and that on the day of moderating in the call, the people, if they disapproved of him, were to say so; and the Presbytery, by the law, were left to decide whether he should be set aside; for the law says that, by their judgement, and at their determination, “the matter shall take end.” So that you see, under that law the Church courts were left free in this matter to do as their duty to Christ appeared to them to require; they were left free not to form the connection between the minister and the people unless the people consented; and to set the minister aside if their duty to Christ obliged them to do so. This brings us down to the act restoring Patronage. The Act of Queen Anne took from the Kirk-Session and heritors the right of naming the minister, and gave the right and power to the Patron; but the law expressly said, that in every thing else the minister was to be admitted in the *same manner, as he would have been admitted before the passing of that act*. Accordingly, the Church believed that although a new person was to name the minister, the courts of the Church and the members of the Church were left in the same position as before the act passed at all—that the Presbytery was left free as before to judge whether the people consented, and if the people withheld their consent, to set the presentee aside, and refuse to settle him in the parish. And this was not a mere fancy of the Church; it acted upon it as a principle, and frequently set men aside, because they had not a call from the people. And although the Patron might be angry, and although he applied to the Court of Session to interfere with the Presbytery, and command them to put in the presentee of the Patron, the Court of Session said, we will decide about this question, so as to determine who shall have the right to the stipend, the manse, and the glebe; because these are temporal things; but we will not decide who shall be the minister of the parish; because, said they, that would be interfering with the internal power of the Church, with which they said, we have nothing to do. That was the principle on which the Court of Session acted through all the last century, and down to the present day. This was the position in which the Church stood, when, in 1834, they passed the Veto Law.”

\* It cannot be too often reiterated that the Church solicited and obtained the sanction of the State to her Confession of Faith and other explanatory Standards, “not with the view of giving them any additional authority as Ecclesiastical deeds, but as a solemn expression of the National Faith, and as a pledge that the Nation would publicly countenance and defend the profession of religion contained in these Standards, in opposition to those who, by secret intrigue and open violence, sought its overthrow, and plotted the destruction of the civil and religious liberties of the country.”

State,—shall we discharge our consciences before God and our fellow-men,—and demonstrate to the world at large, that we are once more an awakened and Reforming Church—resolutely bent on self-expansion and self-purification.\*

Under the influence of views and considerations like these the celebrated Veto Act of 1834, was passed—not as the best which the Church could devise or desire—but as the best defensive and remedial measure which she felt herself competent, by her own independent power, to enact. It was prepared and brought forward by not less eminent a personage than Lord Moncrieff, himself an Elder and office-bearer in the Church, and, by general consent, the profoundest Lawyer on the Scottish Bench. The Act met with the full concurrence and approbation of the Lord Advocate and Solicitor General—the official responsible legal advisers of the Crown. Immediately after its adoption by the Assembly, the Lord High Chancellor of England, then Lord Brougham, from the Woolsack, volunteered a formal proclamation of his entire approval of it. The Government of the day unanimously resolved to acknowledge it, and give it full effect, in all Crown presentations, which constitute about a third of all the livings, or ecclesiastical benefices, in Scotland. Nearly the whole of the remaining Patrons, tacitly or formally acquiesced. However much opposed to its introduction at all, the Moderate party, when once it became the law of the Church, instantly united with the Evangelical, in vigorously carrying its provisions into effect. And during the few years of its undisturbed operation, it wrought with a harmony which surprized, while it extorted the most gratifying acknowledgments from, its bitterest foes. Its beneficial tendencies and effects, in preventing forced and obnoxious settlements—in restoring the alienated affections of the multitude—in re-establishing among all parties, Patrons, Ministers, and people, the rapidly severing bonds of mutual respect and good-will—in introducing every where a race of pious God-fearing shepherds,—and in awakening the dormant spiritual energies of a long-neglected population,—it were vain within our brief space to attempt to delineate. Suffice it to say, that the short-lived period of the Veto Law, will ever be memorable in the annals of the Church of Scotland, as one of the most golden periods in her eventful history. It was the period of great, wide-spread, and unprecedented revivals of religion in divers places throughout her bounds—revivals, which exhibited to the eye of modern sense, somewhat of the mysterious power and reality, which accompanied the fire and the mighty rushing wind and the cloven tongues of the Pentacostal effusion. It was the period of united prayers, intercessions, and supplications for the outpouring of the Spirit, and the speedy establishment of Messiah's Kingdom. It was the period of burning zeal for the maintenance and purity of the

\* The same remark is applicable to this, as to the preceding representation. It is a faithful and condensed epitome of reasons and arguments that were actually employed—as these have been gleaned from an extensive reference to the Newspaper discussions, speeches, and pamphlets of the day.

ordinances of Gods House, the sanctity of the Sabbath, and the observance of solemn fasts. It was the period of enhanced attention to the spiritual gifts and graces, not less than the literary, scientific, and theological attainments, of candidates for the Christian Ministry. It was the period of augmented vigour and unsparing faithfulness and unhesitating promptitude in the exercise of Ecclesiastical discipline on all offenders. It was the period of holy fervour in removing the scandal of mere legalism and secularity and barren forms from the the Courts of the Church, and converting them into houses of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. It was the period of marvellous and abounding liberality in supplying the spiritual necessities of destitute multitudes at home, of myriads of self-exiled countymen abroad, of the millions of benighted heathen, and of the scattered remnants of the House of Israel. It was pre-eminently the period of witnessing for the Redeemer's Crown rights, and the freedom and independence of his spouse, the Church, and the dear-bought liberties of her ransomed children.

What, then, was this famous Veto Act, which, being itself the sign and the product of a reviving Church, soon impelled it forwards, with such giant strides, in the career of improvement? Was it any thing new, unknown, untried, unheard of, before? No;—it was quite the reverse of all this. It was indeed little else, even as to form, than a transcript of the former declaratory Act of 1736. It was not “the establishment of any *new* principle, but merely the revival of the *spirit* of that which had never ceased to exist in the *letter*.” It was therefore, a law not to create, but simply to *restore*—not to innovate, but simply to *revive*—not to enact, but simply to *re-declare*—not to originate what *shall be*, but simply to re-assert what actually *has been*, and *is*, a fundamental and unchanging principle of the Church.

The Act consisted of *two* parts. The *first* was simply a solemn re-declaration of the great scriptural principle of non-intrusion, which ever lay at the foundation of the whole fabric of the Church's Polity—a principle which—however much opposed or resisted, at different times, by the Civil Power, or neglected and allowed to fall into practical desuetude by the Ecclesiastical—never was abrogated from the Standards of the Church, or the Statutes of the realm by which these Standards were ratified. Thus commenced the Veto Act:—“The General Assembly declare, that it is a fundamental principle of this Church, that no Pastor shall be intruded on any congregation contrary to the will of the people; and, in order that this principle may be carried into full effect, the General Assembly do declare, enact, and ordain, that it shall be an instruction to Presbyteries, that if, at the moderating in a call to a vacant pastoral charge, the major part of the male heads of families, members of the vacant congregation, and in full communion with the Church, shall disapprove of the person in whose favour the call is proposed to be moderated in, such disapproval shall be deemed sufficient ground for the Presbytery rejecting such person, and that he shall be rejected accordingly.”

Such was the *first* or *declaratory* part of the Veto Act. The *second* part consisted merely of a series of *rules* or *regulations* for the *practical guidance* of Presbyteries in carrying out the great principle, in a uniform, consistent, and harmonious manner. The *former* part was primary, essential, fundamental; the *latter*, secondary, auxiliary, and subordinate. The former, therefore, could not be varied, altered, modified, or annulled, without entirely destroying the ancient and immemorial constitution of the Church. The latter, might be varied, altered, modified, or annulled at pleasure, and without any damage to her constitution. To the former, accordingly, the Church stood unalterably pledged; while, for the latter, which was designed merely to carry out the former, she was ready, at any time, to substitute any other, which any friendly power might suggest or devise, as better calculated to further the immediate end in view, and, at the same time, conciliate all parties concerned. From this statement it must at once be obvious why the Church, when subsequently called on to do so, could not—in consistency with honour or conscience, or in accordance with her own interpretation of Scripture, as authoritatively embodied in her own Standards,—could not possibly repeal the Veto Law, *as a whole*. To do so, would be, to commit a suicidal act. The second or latter part, she could and would at once repeal, and substitute for it any other,—if that were all. But the head and heart of the law lay in the first or former part, which announced the fundamental principle of Non-Intrusion;—and that part she would not, and could not repeal, without pulling down one of the main pillars on which the entire structure of her Ecclesiastical Polity rested; or rather, without subverting the whole from the very foundation. She could not repeal it, without solemnly declaring *that* to be unscriptural and false, which for three centuries she had persisted in declaring, and re-declaring, to be scriptural and true. She could not repeal it, without surrendering and disposing of the blood-bought liberties of her people, and the heaven-bestowed gifts of her own spiritual freedom and independence, for something like a mess of pottage. She could not repeal it, without, Judas-like, betraying the honour and prerogatives of Christ's Kingly Crown,—for something not unlike the thirty pieces of silver!

In an evil hour, Lord Kinnoul,—a Nobleman far better known in the annals of sporting and horse jockeyship, than in those of social, civil, or religious improvement—presented Mr. Young, a Licentiate,—that is, a Layman simply examined and permitted by a Presbytery of the Church to try or exercise his gifts as a preacher, yet *unordained*,—to the Benefice of *Auchterarder*. Without any objection hinted or mooted, either on his own part, or that of his Patron, he submitted to, and went through, the whole process of the Veto Act Regulations. He was fairly weighed in the balances and found wanting. He was disapproved of by an overwhelming majority of parishioners in full communion with the Church—while, out of the entire population of upwards of 3,000, only *three* had the hardihood to sign his call to be their Pastor. In consequence of this very decisive disapproval on the

part of the people, because of his utter non-acceptability to them, he was rejected by the Presbytery; and the parish again declared vacant. The case, on appeal to the General Assembly, was finally decided against him. Thereupon, backed by his Patron, he raised an action before the Court of Session, the Supreme Civil Court of Scotland, to find, that the Presbytery's rejection of him, on the sole ground of his own non-acceptability and consequent disapproval or dissent on the part of the people, was illegal and a violation of the patrimonial rights of Patrons—and further, that, in consequence of such rejection from such cause, he was still legally entitled to the secular fruits of the benefice. Finally, the case was settled in his favour, and against the Church, by a majority of *three*—there being *eight* of the judges on the one side, and *five* on the other. The former, or majority,\* consisted entirely, either of members of the Episcopal communion, who were deeply prejudiced against the rights, claimed alike by the office-bearers of the Church, and by the heads of the Christian people; or, of men who were Presbyterian Elders, imbued from infancy with Moderate principles, and deeply committed, by many previous overt acts, to the maintenance and support of Moderate ascendancy. The latter, or minority, included† by far the ablest and most talented men on the Scottish Bench. The former rested their judgment *almost, if not altogether, exclusively* on a *new and hitherto unheard of* interpretation of the Patronage Act of Queen Anne, which itself was wholly illegal, *as* being in violation of National faith and National treaties. The latter piled up fact upon fact, precedent on precedent, argument on argument, demonstration on demonstration—enough, and more than enough, to satisfy a hundred times over, any judgment, which was not pre-occupied and foreclosed, yea hermetically sealed against all conviction, that the foresaid interpretation was not only more stringent than had ever been suggested or imagined before—not only a perfect novelty in Scottish jurisprudence during the 130 years since the base bad Act was passed—but also, in direct contradiction to the express provisions of many other clear, explicit, and unambiguous Statutes, which were re-ratified at the Revolution Settlement, and re-confirmed by the Treaty of Union—Statutes, which even the treacherous Act of 1712, had left *wholly untouched and unrepealed*—and which, therefore, on every principle of reason, equity, and right, ought to be allowed to guide, regulate, and conclusively determine a purely legal decision. But all in vain. The majority‡ were doggedly bent on cleaving inflexibly to their stern and unconstitutional resolve.

\* These were, the Lord President, Lord Justice Clerk, Lords Gillies, Meadowbank, Mackenzie, Medwyn, and Corehouse.

† These were Lords Glenlee, Moncrieff, Jeffrey, Cockburn, and Fullarton.

‡ The following statement, drawn up, *at the time*, by one who was an intelligent eye and ear witness of what he records, and then inserted by him in the *Scottish Guardian*, may now be read with enhanced interest and profit:—

“It is a curious fact that Lord Glenlee, the oldest judge on the bench by nine



On Appeal to the House of Lords, the Highest Court of appellate jurisdiction, the decision of the majority in the Lower Court, was confirmed—exactly in the same narrow and unconstitutional way, and for precisely the same partial, one-sided, and unconstitutional reasons.

years, and it is said the oldest in Britain—having been forty-three years on the bench and eighty-three years of age—was the only judge who did not read his speech; and it is still more remarkable that, short as it was—for he did not speak more than twenty minutes—no opinion has damaged so much the legal authority of the judgment. He meddled with nothing but the legal question—he had not a word to say on the merits of the Veto Act. The consent of the people was in his view a matter for ecclesiastical regulation, and having stated in a very able and distinct and graphic way, though not very audibly, several arguments in support of this opinion, he concluded, that the action could not be maintained. He quoted one or two of the Acts in confirmation of his view; but though he did not enter upon those elaborate histories and nice distinctions, which formed the chief part of the opinions of his brethren, it was manifest that he had fully understood the merits of the case; and the influence of his opinion on the lawyers generally is the best evidence of its value. The uncommon independence of mind and intellectual acumen of Lord Glenlee, unimpaired by years, render his opinion invaluable to the Church, as a legal authority. He had certainly no prejudices or bias in favour of the Veto Act, and therefore his opinion has the greater weight. I was quite right in conjecturing that Lord Glenlee's opinion was altogether unexpected. It had been taken for granted, that he concurred with the majority, and the impression, when he declared that the question was wholly within the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, appeared very manifest in the change of some of the more expressive countenances. It would have been well if the other judges had confined themselves as rigidly as did Lord Glenlee to the legal question. The right of the Church to pass the Veto Law might be before the Court, but certainly its wisdom or expediency were not. Nevertheless, its whole merits were discussed, and by every one of the majority it was condemned. The most gross Erastianism was openly avowed. A party in the Church, not the least faithful to the cause for which a Church is of any use, was charged with bigotry and enthusiasm; but this was by one who, in the Assembly some years ago, spoke of the *sacrament* of marriage, and therefore his opinion is of the less consequence. The Parliament was declared by a Presbyterian judge to be “the temporal head of the Church,” though, in the Second Book of Discipline, of ecclesiastical, if not civil authority, it is said that the Church has not “a temporal head on the earth;” and though the Confession of Faith denies the headship of any other over the Church, “but the Lord Jesus Christ,” it was said that the Church was “a mere corporation;” and by another, the Church was described as “the mere creature of the law,” and deriving all its rights from the law. Even Blair's Sermons were eulogised, and the policy of Principal Robertson applauded. The whole Church History of Scotland was dragged in, and the constitution of foreign Protestant Churches, and even Roman Catholic Churches, though regulated by other Statutes, and dissimilar in every respect, were adduced as analogous cases. No wonder that the speeches extended to seven days. The senior judges having entered on so large a field of discussion, it was impossible that those who followed, and who were of the minority, could leave such arguments, however irrelevant, without notice; and to this cause must be attributed the elaborate, but most able and necessary argument of Lord Moncrieff. Of the opinions against the Veto Law, that of Lord Corehouse was the most relevant to the question, and in some respects it was a beautiful oration. Proceeding on a false definition of Patronage—overlooking the independent legislative character of the Church, and the place the consent of the people has always held in her constitution, and though much more specious than profound, it nevertheless possessed great merit in respect of

Such having been the *first Auchterarder* decision, it is important to note its precise aim, object, and bearing.

By certain unrepealed Statutes, the sole right to judge of every thing connected with the qualifications of presentees is conceded to the Church, while the right of disapproval is reserved to the people.

the order and ingenuity of the reasoning—the various stores of learning with which it was enriched—the classic elegance of the language—and the style and manner of the delivery. You can have no idea of this from the newspaper report. Yet there were some very egregious errors in his reasoning. He held that the only argument on the other side must rest on the assumption, that Patronage is either a joint right, or a right by sufferance; but I apprehend it is neither the one nor the other. So far as it goes, the Patron's right is exclusively his; and the fact is, that the people, while they may have no joint right with him in the same subject, may have with him distinct rights in different parts of the same process. This was happily illustrated by Lord Jeffrey, when showing also the value of such a right to the Patron, by a reference to the legislative functions of either House of Parliament and the Sovereign, which are not separately effective, but which are acknowledged to be most important; and to each juror, who in civil causes has a negative on the verdict. Lord Corehouse quoted the First Book of Discipline, to show that even Knox did not acknowledge the negative in the people without reasons, because they were to be compelled to consent by the censures of the Church; but to this very passage Lord Moncrieff appealed with great effect, as evidence of the necessity of the form of consent, seeing it was so important, that it must be wrung out by so severe a process. The main fallacy that ran through all the arguments of the majority was, that Patronage being a civil right—the right when injured or encroached upon must be maintained by civil authority, and that that authority was in the *Court of Session*. This fallacy was admirably exposed by Lord Moncrieff, by supposing the case of a minister labelled for heresy, and sentence of deposition following against the evidence; though his patrimonial rights were unjustly injured here, could that Court entertain the question whether he was guilty of heresy? If not, the principle which was now applied to to the present case, could not be maintained. Altogether the whole chain of Lord Moncrieff's argument on the shape and competency of the action, and the constitutional history and rights of the Church, was admirably sustained. He very emphatically denied many of the extraordinary errors, as to the dependence of the Church, of his brethren in the majority. He argued with great force the question of jurisdiction, from a consideration of the various Acts of Parliament and the constitution of the Church—the cases adjudged by the Court, and the insurmountable difficulties in the way of their doing anything, to which he referred as confirming the soundness of his general opinion; and I do not doubt that his speech will form a most valuable chapter in the history of the Church. His description of the right of patronage AS A TRUST, and of the many limitations to which without dispute, it had been subjected by the Church, particularly, that though by the statute all that was required was, that the person presented should be "qualified," the Patron was obliged, but only by the subsequent authority of the Church, to present "a licentiate," was very effective. I look upon the opinions of Lords Moncrieff and Jeffrey, as the ablest of the whole. The latter pursued a line of illustration, if not argument, distinct from any who had preceded him on the same side, and yet confirmatory of their main positions. Notwithstanding the disadvantages of delivery, his elucidations, I have reason to believe, have had a great influence in convincing a number of persons of the legality of the Veto Act; and I have no doubt that when his opinion is read in the extended report, that its excellencies will be still more highly appreciated. He threw an air of originality over the whole discussion, and did a great deal to disembarass the subject by the accuracy of his definitions—the vividness and aptness of his analogies—the clear manner

These two rights, except when the Church herself became faithless, and through her faithlessness, the people lapsed into indifference, were in constant and vigorous exercise. By a Reforming Church they were very naturally and properly revived, after the dark age during which they had become practically obsolete. Now, however, the Civil Courts,—in the face of all past experience, in the face of opposing precedents, in the face of contrary statutes,—suddenly; strangely, and to the amazement of the sober, the wise, and the good, decided that the Presbyteries had no legal right to judge of any qualifications except those technically connected with Life, Literature, and Doctrine, and that the people had no legal right of disapproval at all. And what was the result of this?—That the non-acceptability of the presentee was now to be regarded as no legal disqualification—and the disapproval or aversion, or dissent of the people as no legal ground of rejection. And what, again, was the result of this?—That an unacceptable presentee, rejected on such grounds, is declared to be illegally rejected. And what, once more, was the result of this? That, being illegally rejected, he is still entitled, by the terms of another Act of Parliament, which expressly provides for such a case, to the whole fruits of the benefice. The gist of the first Auchterarder decision, therefore, lay in this—that, in every case, in which a presentee was rejected, solely in consequence of the people's disapproval or dissent, *there*, the temporal benefice must, henceforth, be liable to be separated from the spiritual cure, during the life of the presentee.

in which he traced and marked out the line betwixt the jurisdictions, and the very felicitous illustrations by which he supported the distinction. He regarded the Church as an independent legislative body as well as a judicial body. I was much struck with one of his arguments. It had been said that where the Church went beyond her powers, the remedy was necessarily in that Court; but he argued that at least two conditions were required in order to his—not only that she should have exceeded her powers, but that she should have gone *extra provinciam*. This he illustrated by references to the Courts of Justiciary and Exchequer, and the now abolished Consistorial Court. The Court of Session could not open up the question of the validity of a marriage, which had been concluded in the Consistorial Court; and if in a case of high treason by an heir of entail, the Justiciary Court, having no discretion in the punishment of the guilty, were to pronounce sentence of transportation instead of death, could an action of damages be maintained in that Court against the Justiciary Judge, at the instance of the next heir on account of injury to his patrimonial rights? Certainly not; and this was yet a case where the Court had exceeded its powers, but had not gone *extra provinciam*."

In the conclusion of his reasons of judgment, Lord Cockburn made certain memorable reflections, which, as has been truly remarked, subsequent events "have elevated to the character of a prophetic warning"—a warning, however, which was unhappily lost on the majority of the Court. "It is the duty," said his Lordship, "of a Supreme Court to avoid every collision through which it cannot see its way. Its dignity must necessarily be put in jeopardy by its exposing itself to a conflict in which it cannot explain how it is to prevail. This, I fear, is the position in which this Court is about to place itself. It is about to enter upon an untried voyage without a compass or a star—no one, either at the bar, or on the Bench, can tell us what is to come next."

Now, however *novel*, *grievous* and *unconstitutional*, this decision might appear to the Church, still, as it directly affected only the *temporalities*, which she had derived from the State, and over which the State had absolute control—not touching, at least formally or in express terms, or in its immediate operation, her own spiritual jurisdiction—leaving her free, in other respects, to act out her own principles, in making *spiritual* provision for the parish from whose cure the benefice had been, in her belief, wrongfully severed,—she at once bowed (*quoad temporalia*) with implicit submission to the Law of the Land, as now finally declared by the highest Civil Court of Appeal. Accordingly, the General Assembly of May 1839, instructed the Presbytery of Auchterarder “to offer no farther resistance to the claims of Mr. Young, or of the Patron to the emoluments of the benefice of Auchterarder, and to refrain from claiming the “*jus devolutum*” (the lapsed right of presentation,) “or any other civil right or privilege connected with the said benefice”—strongly re-asserting, at the same time, “the principle of non-intrusion, as one coeval with the Reformed Kirk of Scotland, and forming an integral part of its constitution, embodied in its Standards, and declared in various Acts of Assembly”—firmly resolving “that this principle cannot be abandoned, and that no presentee shall be forced upon any parish contrary to the will of the congregation”—and, at the same time also, “appointing a committee for the purpose of considering in what way the privileges of the National Establishment, and the harmony between Church and State, may remain unimpaired, with instructions to confer with the Government of the country if they see cause.” Thus the Assembly interposed its supreme authority to prevent the Presbytery from ordaining Mr. Young as Minister of Auchterarder—leaving it to him and to his Patron to do what they willed with the civil benefice, which the Civil Law had now pronounced to be their own.

According to all former precedent the immediate affair would have ended here. The rejected, because unacceptable, presentee would unworthily enjoy for life the temporal fruits of the benefice. The Presbytery would proceed to the ordination and settlement of an acceptable Pastor, whom they and the people would have to support, as best they could, till the death of the *sinecure* presentee. While the Church would vigorously appeal to the Supreme Legislature for such declaratory or enactive law, as would fully recognize her own absolute and indefeasible right to judge, under responsibility to her Great Head alone, of *all* the qualifications essential to the Pastoral relationship; clearly sanction the inalienable rights, and liberties of the people; and definitively prevent any similar incongruous severance of the temporal benefice from the spiritual cure in the time to come.

But the spirit of the world was roused;—the spirit of legalism—the spirit of formalism—the spirit of aristocratic pride—the spirit of hatred at pure, holy, searching, stirring evangelic truth. Hence, must fresh efforts be made to encroach still farther on the hitherto sacred and unviolated domain of the Church, and, if possible, to

crush her rising liberties. Already had a breach been effected and a high way opened through the ramparts of hitherto impregnable Statutes. And why not strive to increase the breach, and widen, or even multiply the high ways? A new action, accordingly, is now raised before the Court of Session, to find, not merely that an obnoxious presentee, rejected on the now newly declared illegal ground of the people's dissent, is still entitled to the temporalities of the benefice, but also, that he is *additionally entitled to be admitted, however unworthy, to the spiritualities of the cure*—and that the Presbytery is *bound, under compulsion of civil pains and penalties, to take him on trials for ORINATION!*

The raising of this action, which was of a nature *altogether new, unheard of, and without a precedent in the constitutional history of the Church of Scotland*, was the signal for all the enemies of the Church being up in arms, in fiercest and most threatening array. It was the signal for the commencement of a series of petty annoyances and vexatious harassments, on the part of an unreasoning and infatuated squirearchy, “dressed in a little brief authority.” It was the signal, above all, for the rapid extension and multiplication of encroachments, on the part of the Court of Session, which, in spite of reclaiming statutes, violently intruded itself into every nook and corner of the Ecclesiastical edifice—leaving no compartment unviolated, no foundation stone unturned. A full narrative of these Erastian encroachments which followed each other, in swift and bewildering succession, would occupy whole volumes. Our present limits will not allow us to furnish even specimens. We can only point out the *general classes\** to which most of these might be reduced. At present, then, we must be satisfied with asserting, as a simple and notorious matter of historical fact, that decisions were given by the Court of Session—subject doubtless to appeal and revision by the House of Lords—by which ;—

FIRST.—*The surviving liberties of the Christian people were wholly subverted.*

SECOND.—*All extension and enlargement of the Church, in obedience to the divine command, was completely arrested.*

THIRD.—*All ordinary spiritual discipline and ecclesiastical order were entirely destroyed.*

FOURTH.—*All the most sacred ordinances of the Christian faith were sacrilegiously interfered with.*

FIFTH.—*All spiritual and independent jurisdiction and government were laid prostrate in the dust.*

Then came, under this last and most important head of spiritual jurisdiction, the fatal and crushing blow,—the final decision, by appeal to the House of Lords, of the *second Auchterarder* case. The decision of the *first* case had settled that,—in every instance, in which a presentee was rejected on the ground mainly of his own unacceptability, and the regularly ascertained and solemnly recorded dissent or

\* In an Appendix or Supplement, illustrative examples or specimens of each of these classes will afterwards be supplied.

unconquerable repugnance of the people,—there, the temporalities of the benefice were liable to be separated from the spiritual cure. The final decision of the *second*, conclusively established the law, as now for the *first* time interpreted, to be,—that a Presbytery must not merely relinquish the benefice, in a case like that already supposed, but, moreover, is not at liberty to refuse; in other words, is bound to take the rejected candidate on trials *for ordination*—and that, because of such refusal, it “may be found liable in damages to such amount as a jury may award; although no malice can be proved, and the Presbytery has done nothing more than act in obedience to the commands of its Ecclesiastical superiors.” The general doctrine in law, expressed in this finding of the Court of Session, confirmed by the House of Lords, has been, with slight variation, otherwise stated thus:—“The Civil Courts may review, and, if they see cause, alter the judgments of any Presbytery of the Church, in the admission of Ministers to a Pastoral charge, and may visit a Presbytery with civil pains and penalties, if it shall refuse to submit to their judgment.” And to prove beyond all controversy, that this decision was not intended to be a mere *brutum fulmen*—a blustering terrifying sound, signifying nothing—the helpless and the guiltless Presbytery of Auchterarder, besides losing the benefice, was remorselessly fined in the enormous sum of £16,000—failing to pay which, their wives and families must be reduced to beggary, and themselves pine away and rot in a dungeon! Well, might Lord Moncrieff, with emphasis exclaim from the Bench, that not one shred of spiritual liberty, not one independent spiritual function was now left to the once noble, and free, and independent Church of Scotland! For, the *principle* of the law, as now declared, was clear and peremptory, viz. that, in every instance whatsoever, in which a Presbytery presumed to refuse to do the bidding of the Civil Courts, even in the purest of all spiritual matters, such as *ordination*,—however contrary to its own convictions of duty, however contrary to its own interpretation of Scripture, and Confession of faith, and other Standards, which it had vowed to make its only guides, and however contrary to the positive injunctions of its Ecclesiastical superiors, whom in all such matters it had sworn implicitly to obey,\*—it was liable to be punished, as if its members were notorious wrong doers, or convicted malefactors†!

\* This, as justly and properly remarked in the Claim of Right, was a feature common to the greater number of encroachments complained of, that, the inferior judicatories of the Church “were required to disobey the sentences, in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, of the superior judicatories, to which, by the Constitution in Church and State, they are subordinate and subject, and which, in compliance with the provisions of the Statutes of the realm, their members have sworn solemnly to obey:—thus subverting the government of the Church by Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial Synods and General Assemblies, settled by Statute and the Treaty of Union, as the only government of the Church within the kingdom of Scotland.”

† Since the above was written I have met with the following luminous and impressive statement on the subject, by the Revd. Dr. Buchanan of Glasgow:—

“But what I wish you to understand is, that it is not the fact of our being lia-

That the Civil Courts by these Ultra-Erastian usurpations and encroachments, impiously violated the Crown-rights and most sacred prerogatives of the great Head of the Church and only King in Zion—contemptuously set at nought his laws, his orders, his institutions, his will, and his authority—and violently trampled under foot the freely bestowed rights, liberties, and privileges of the members of his Body, and subjects of his Kingdom—is clear beyond all controversy or debate. Whoever will recall to mind, and practically apply the scriptural principles laid down and established in the *first* Lecture of the present course, must perceive the inevitableness of this conclusion, as with the glance of intuition.

But, should any one still step forward, saying ;—“ Granted,—because, it is too obvious to admit of any dispute—granted, that all the rights, liberties and privileges of the Church of Scotland, considered simply as a Church of Christ, have been trodden in the dust, by the adverse and unprecedented decisions of the Civil Courts ;—is it equally clear, that all her rights, liberties, and privileges, viewed as the Ecclesiastical Establishment, recognized and ratified, as such, by the State, have, in like manner and in an equal degree, been trodden in the dust ?”

ble to the loss of certain sums of money—that is a grievance ;—but the power which the Civil Courts claim over the Church Courts, is the grievance of which we complain, and to which we never can submit. We maintain that the Presbytery, as a Court of the Church of Scotland, and the Church of Christ, in dealing with the question, who is to be the Minister of a parish, must deal with it on their own sense of duty, and on their responsibility to Christ as their Lord and Head ; and if, in pronouncing judgment, they are to be punished with actions of damages for acting on their own conscientious convictions of duty, their liberties are destroyed,—they are no longer the free servants of Christ, but the slaves of the Civil power,—doing their work not for the glory of Christ, but to please certain Patrons and presentees—doing it to save their property from being taken from them,—doing it as a slave does his work, and not as Christ's freemen. When a jury are brought to decide on a case of life or property, they are left to do so according to their own consciences,—no man may come in to say to them, they must decide according to his will. The Queen cannot tell them what their verdict must be ; and no jury would consent to act at all if any power on earth had a right to come in between them and their own consciences. And so it is with the judges on the Bench. The Queen has the power of granting them their commission as judges ; but when they take their seats on the Bench, the Queen dare not tell them how they are to decide in any case, or even to hint what their judgment should be. No power on earth can interfere with their consciences ; and if it were otherwise, we would say, that the Bench of justice was polluted—that justice was polluted on the very seat of judgment, and that there was no security for life or property in the realm. Now, if this be the dictate of common sense in judging of temporal things, shall not the same principle be held sacred in judging of spiritual things ? Is a judge to be left free to the exercise of his conscience in judging of a man's property ?—and am I, as a Minister of Christ, sitting as a judge in an Ecclesiastical Court, not to be allowed the same freedom ? Am I to judge under an action of damages hanging over my head, and under the liability of my property being taken from me, and myself cast into jail ? Will any man say, that the Government of Christ's Church can be carried on in such circumstances ? And, therefore, if the law on which these judgments are founded is not altered, it is impossible for the Church to remain in connection with the State of this realm.”

To this question, the reply to which has already been substantially anticipated, the unhesitating and emphatic answer is, in the *affirmative*. These strange and untoward decisions trod down the latter quite as much as the former. And why? For the simplest and best of all reasons—that the spiritual freedom and independence of the Church, with all the rights, liberties, and privileges, flowing from the supremacy of her Great Head and King, and intrinsically belonging to her, as a portion of his mystical Body, were, one and all of them without exception, specially, expressly, and positively recognized and guaranteed to her by Statutes of the Realm and National Treaties, in her other distinct capacity as the Establishment, or corporate Ecclesiastical Body, endowed and established by the State.

Such was not merely the ineradicable persuasion of the Church herself—founded on the constant and invariable experience of a century and a half;—but such also was, and is, still, the ineradicable conviction of the ablest lawyers at the Scottish bar, and the ablest judges on the Scottish Bench,—founded on the express enactments of statutory law. Did the Court of Session tear up by the roots the surviving remnant of the liberties of the people? Express statutes, yet in force, were appealed to, which still reserved that remnant, in spite of the odious Patronage Act. Was the Church's power of self-extension, and self-enlargement denied, and her onward progress cruelly arrested? History, precedents and statutes without number, still in force, were appealed to, which proved, that, from the Reformation downwards, the Church regulated every thing connected with the appointment and location of its own Pastors—increasing their number—apportioning their spheres of labour—distributing their services over districts more or less extended—conferring on them new spiritual charges—collegiating some and uncollegiating others—granting commissions to itinerate through different and distant parts, to preach the gospel, and administer ordinances, according to every new or varying emergency—yea, and to plant new Churches, with their Ministers, Elders, and Deacons in every necessitous locality, without any let, hindrance, or limitation whatsoever. Did the Court of Session invade the Church's spiritual jurisdiction, in regard to the ordination and admission of Ministers, the preaching of the Word, and administration of Sacraments? Statutes of the Realm, still in force, were appealed to, which expressly recognized and proclaimed such jurisdiction exclusively to belong to the Church, as “directly given to it by God, and to be beyond the limits of the secular jurisdiction.” Did the Court of Session trench upon, and ultimately clean subvert the Church's free and independent government, by coercing Presbyteries, under civil compulsitors, to disobey and set at defiance the sentences, in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, of their superior Church judicatories? Statutes of the Realm, still in force, were appealed to, which testified that ordination vows and oaths to obey ecclesiastical superiors were among the most stringent requirements exacted by these statutes, as well as by the Act of Security, embodied in the Treaty of Union. Did the Court of Session



contemptuously set aside the entire order and discipline of the Church? Statutes of the Realm, still in force, were appealed to, by which all judges and officers of justice are peremptorily ordered "to give due assistance" for making all Church discipline and censures "to be obeyed, or otherwise effectual"—and by which, the supporting of deposed ministers in the exercise of ministerial functions, is prohibited and denounced as "a high contempt of the authority of the Church, and of the laws of the kingdom establishing the same." But, without enlarging farther on this particular head, it is enough to say, that there was not one usurpation, encroachment, or interference on the part of the Court of Session, which was not demonstrated by the ablest lawyers and judges themselves, to be as subversive of the Constitution and Statutes of the Realm, as they were palpably subversive of the constitution of a Church of Christ, and the Laws of his Spiritual Kingdom—as subversive, therefore, of the constitutional and statutory rights, liberties, and privileges of the Scottish subjects of the British Crown, as they were palpably subversive of the prerogatives of the Great Head of the Church, and of the heaven-conferred rights, liberties, and privileges of the spiritual members of his Body and subjects of His Crown.

What, then, is to be done? The National Church is at open, and deadly war with the National Constitution, as now, in a new and strange and unwonted way, interpreted and enforced by the Civil Courts. What, then, is to be done? The sacred rights and privileges, derived directly from her Great Head, and now so flagrantly invaded by the Civil Courts, the Church is thoroughly persuaded, have been expressly recognized and ratified by the State, whose creature and servant for the decision of all "*actions civil*," the Court of Session is, as well as the House of Lords itself, in its appellate capacity. Well, says the Church, let me appeal from the servants to the Master. Let me see whether the Master will interpose to deliver me from the vexatious encroachments, unjust invasions, and unconstitutional interferences of his servants. If he do, then shall I experience deliverance. If he do not, then, there is no resource but to withdraw altogether, and put myself beyond the reach alike of the aggressive tyranny of the servants, and the constructive tyranny of an unjust, because unjustly conniving, Master.

Thus did the Church resolve to make her final appeal to the State—or Supreme Legislature of the Realm. And forward she went, not as a humble beggarly Petitioner, imploring new favours, but as a party deeply aggrieved, claiming the continued inviolable enjoyment of her ancient and hereditary rights. Her attitude bespoke a meaning and a language to this effect:—

The law is now interpreted, and attempted to be enforced in a way utterly unknown to our forefathers, and which they would not have tolerated for a single hour. The question then is, Will the Supreme Power of the State allow or sanction this new interpretation of law, and unheard of mode of its enforcement? The law, as now declared by the supreme Civil Courts, is totally different from, and contrary to the constitutional precedents and decisions of these very

Courts themselves during the last hundred and fifty years. The question then is, Will the Supreme Power of the State recognize and uphold the former constitutional precedents and decisions of its own Courts, or will it, in the exercise of its sovereignty, homologate the recent, unprecedented, unconstitutional and adverse decisions? We ask no favours—we sue for no concessions. We simply claim, *as of right*, that which can be proved rightfully to belong to us. And our demand is to know, Whether we are to be allowed to continue in the enjoyment of our legal and constitutional, not less than our spiritual rights, or resignedly suffer ourselves to be robbed of them all?—Whether or not, we are to be permitted to continue in the undisturbed possession of what our ancestors believed they had secured by unalterable treaties, and we ourselves ever believed to have been transmitted to us, as the most precious of all legacies, and the most inalienable of all heritages? Or, to adopt the language of a late Memorial, “Is the law, as now declared by the Civil Courts, to be held, and allowed to remain the civil law of the country, so as to compel the Church, however reluctantly, to adopt those measures which her duty and the interests of religion appear to her, under such circumstances, to require?” Or, are the benefits and the blessings of an Establishment, for which we and our fathers have so zealously contended, to be *now* declared as capable of being enjoyed, *only* by conceding the divine principles, violating the scriptural constitution, and surrendering the spiritual independence of the Church;—all of which, hitherto, have been regarded not merely as belonging to it, intrinsically, as a Church of Christ, but also constitutionally, as the recognized and established Church of this kingdom—ratified and confirmed by the most explicit Statutes of the Realm and the most solemn National treaties, and by these declared to be unalterable for ever? Or, in other words still, Is the British State *now*, or is it not, to announce to the world its ultimate decision to be, that, henceforth, the terms and conditions of a Civil Establishment of Christianity must be regarded as essentially incompatible with the freedom and independence, the rights and the liberties, of a Free Church of Christ?

In March last, the lawful, the constitutional, the treaty-protected claims of the deeply injured Church of Scotland, were submitted, for vindication and redress, to the Imperial Legislature. What was the result? By the almost unanimous voice of the House of Lords, and by an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons, they were completely negatived.\* The very evil which our pious ancestors had contemplated with dread—and which they fondly believed they had for ever averted, by an Act of Security, to which the faith of England, as a Nation, had been solemnly plighted—was now, alas, realized. Instead of simply ascertaining from Statutes, and Acts of

\* It is proper to note that the *great majority* of the Scottish members did their duty—strenuously voting in behalf of the claims of their National Church.

Security, and Treaties of Union, and Standards ratified by the State, what the principles, and claims of the Church *really* and *righteously were*; the United Legislature virtually, if not formally, set about propounding what its principles and claims *ought to be*, according to its own new-fangled notions, or according to certain tests and criteria, supplied by analogy from cases altogether incongruous, inapplicable, and inept. "The Spiritual claims of the Church of Scotland," said the Home Secretary of State "must *in limine* be extinguished." "The question," said the Prime Minister of Great Britain, "must be settled," not on the principles of Scottish Presbyterianism, but "of English jurisprudence."

From his power to carry or negative any measure, the hostile voice of the latter was decisive—being virtually the voice of the British State. The whole tone, tenour, temper, and substance of his address on the occasion, may be epitomized and condensed as follows:—

Having, by superior tact, talent, and industry, re-gathered and consolidated the most powerful political party in modern times,—*I* have reached the climax of earthly dignity and earthly power. *I* now wield the destinies of Imperial Britain, on whose dominions the sun never sets. *My* voice is heard influentially in the Cabinets of Europe, the Councils of America, and the Divans of Asia. From Greenland to New Zealand—from Pekin to Peru—across oceans and continents—may *my* high behests be conveyed by invincible fleets and armies. *I* do what *I* will, and who can let or hinder *me*? *I* refuse what *I* will, and who dare contravene *my* decision? *I* know no kingdom or empire within this realm save that of the British State. *I* know and can tolerate no supreme will, or authority, or jurisdiction, within this realm, save one,—and that is the paramount will, authority, and jurisdiction of Queen, Lords, and Commons. The claims of the Church of Scotland, therefore, in behalf of another empire and kingdom, which they call spiritual, and that of Christ:—its claims, in behalf of another supreme will, power, and authority, which they call spiritual too, and that of Christ, His Crown and Covenant;—*I—I—even I—DO NOT, WILL NOT, AND SHALL NOT CONCEDE.*

Such was the decisive rejection of the claims of the Church of Scotland by the British State. But these claims—what were they? Not the claims of an ordinary secular society, for ordinary secular ends. No! They were the claims of a Church of Christ for the admission of those spiritual rights and privileges, which had been freely conferred by Him, as its Great Head and King. They were claims, therefore, the admission or rejection of which essentially involved the admission or rejection of the rights, the prerogatives, and the supremacy of Him, who is the Lord's Anointed—the sovereign Head of the Church—the King and Governor among the nations! But, is it not an eternal truth, that they who honour and glorify the Son, and they alone, honour and glorify the Father—while they that honour not and glorify not the Son, honour not and glorify not the Father? To reject the Son is anti-christianism; and in him, to reject the Father, is Atheism! And

for the British State, in the person of its official representative, to pronounce such an adverse *ultimatum*, in reference to the claims of the Church of Scotland, in behalf of her own rights and privileges, involving, as these indisputably did, the honour and prerogatives of her Great Head,—what was it but the virtual renunciation of National allegiance to Christ—the virtual proclamation of a National Anti-Christian Apostacy—the virtual avowal of a National Infidelity or Atheism?—Woe unto the rulers that have acted in this matter, as if smitten with judicial blindness! For, if their decision be unrevoked, it will, sooner or later, prove the death-knell of the British State!

But, though the State thus committed a great sin against the Supreme Head of the Church, that was no reason why the Church should prove faithless too. Quite the reverse. The Church resolutely determined to wash her own hands of the guilt of this National sin. But how was this to be done? We shall now see. Of the Church of Scotland, as of each man's house in England, it has been said by the most eloquent of living theologians, in the immortal sentences of Chatham:—"It is his castle—not that it is surrounded with walls and battlements. It may be a straw-built shed; every wind of heaven may whistle round it, every element of heaven may enter it; but the king cannot—the king dare not." No! But what the king cannot legally; and dare not constitutionally;—the king yet can illegally, and may dare unconstitutionally, by the chicaneries of insulted justice, or the might of armed force. So with the Church of Scotland. The king could not legally, dared not constitutionally, enter it. But what the king, or supreme sovereign power, could not so do, was now done illegally and unconstitutionally. The statutory and constitutional fences and bulwarks of the Church had now been violently thrown down. The sacred enclosure had been rudely entered. Its firmest foundations had been undermined; its strongest towers dismantled; its fairest palaces spoiled; its holiest sanctuaries polluted. What, then, could the true sons—the faithful children—of Zion, do? What could they do, but come out from the unclean thing, and be separate? What could they do, but come out, in the name and strength of their Great Head, with their principles unchanged, their honour unsullied, their integrity vindicated, the banner of their Great King unlowered, and the glorious prerogatives of his Kingly Crown, held up in richer emblazonry to the admiring nations! What could they do, but go forth, bearing with them the ark of the everlasting covenant, with all the other badges and ensigns of ancient glory and renown, and seek for themselves another Zion, and build up for themselves another Jerusalem, and rear another temple, where they might deposit the ark of the testimony, and worship the God of their Fathers, and enshrine their votive offerings amid the glories of a new Schekinah, and freely consecrate their earthly all to the honour of their own Immanuel.

This, accordingly, is what they resolutely determine, in the name and strength of their God, to do. But, desiring that all should be done decently and in order—desiring that all should be done with the

dignity and solemnity befitting the grandeur of so mighty a National movement—they calmly and patiently abide their time.

At length, the memorable day—the 18th May, 1843,—a day much to be remembered in the annals of Scotland, arrived. For days before, there was a mustering, and a gathering, of forces to the metropolis. The general outward aspect of things is changed. A strange and ominous foreboding seizes and occupies the minds of men. All look grave—solemn—austerely meditative. Riot is banished from the streets; mirth is silent at the festive board; the voice of music and of song is touched with an air of plaintive melody. Every thing betokens the approach of some mighty movement—the awful hour of some grand catastrophe. The Church of St. Andrew's—the national saint of Scotland in days of Popish Idolatry—is specially fitted up for the occasion. Thither, the marshalled forces resort. There, they assemble in battle array. The antagonist principles, which convulsed the nation, and were now to rend the Church asunder, were there—embodied in the appropriate forms of the servants of Christ, and the servants of Cæsar. The House is divided into two. Look first at the side of worldly dignity and honour. Behold that brilliant spectacle with its dazzling throng. A visible throne is there, with its purple canopy. The Royal Commissioner is there—the visible representative of British Majesty. The nobles of the land, the proud wearers of stars, swords, and coronets, are there—with their faithful satellites, joyously basking in borrowed radiance—and eager to do homage to the rising star and sensible symbol of earthly Royalty. All things are there,—fitted to allure the carnal eye, and fill and satisfy the carnal heart. Then turn to the *other* side. No visible throne is there—no marks or signs of earthly royalty are there—no gorgeous drapery is there—no obtrusive display of armorial devices is there—no shining emblems of ancient lineage and feudal pedigree are there;—nought is there, fitted to attract the carnal eye, or fill and satisfy the carnal heart. But, to the eye of faith, before which the invisible is revealed, and the distant realized as present, there are transcendent glories manifested there. *There*, is He, who holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, and who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks. Faith at once recognizes Him, who is fairer than the sons of men—the Chief among ten thousand, and altogether lovely. Faith at once hails and proclaims him King of Zion—King of Glory—King of Saints. His servants are there—his chosen servants—who fought the good fight—and, in many a battle-field, were ready to die, rather than suffer the lustre of his crown to be tarnished, or the glory of his sovereignty to be eclipsed. And all the faithful of the land are there,—in winged prayers that have sped to heaven and returned, swifter than the sun-beam, laden with blessing. And holy angels are there, as ministering spirits,—hovering over the scene, with outstretched wings, in admiring complacency. All things are ready. The time—the hour—the decisive moment is come. To the National Established Church of Scotland,

in the persons of her chosen delegates, the final question is substantially put—put, in the face of the Nation, in the face of Christendom, in the face of the world ;—Which of the two great antagonist principles is to prevail?—the power of faith, or the power of sense—the love of heaven, or the love of earth—fealty to Christ, or fealty to Cæsar—the honour and prerogative of Zion's King, or the exaltation of Zion's sacrilegious spoiler—the freedom and independence of the Church, the Redeemer's immaculate Spouse, or its unconditional surrender and submission, at the lordly dictation of a usurping foreign power ?

A deep and thrilling pause ensues. At length, the representative voice of the faithful, through their appointed organ, is heard in accents that bespeak the majesty of principle and of truth :—Faith hath triumphed over sense ; heaven over earth ; Christ over Cæsar. From this hour we sever our connection with the State, as that connection can no longer be maintained without a surrender of the prerogatives of our Great Head, and all the blood-bought rights and liberties of his ministers and people. But these we cannot, we dare not surrender. They are not ours to give ; but His, whose they are by inalienable right of eternal covenant. In order to maintain these sacredly inviolate, we hereby renounce our status, our honours, and other civil advantages—our homes, and incomes, and earthly all. In order to maintain these inviolate, we now separate ourselves,—not from the Church of Scotland, as a true Church of Christ,—for her sound scriptural Standards we still revere, and her simple and noble scriptural constitution we still admire,—but from the Ecclesiastical Establishment of Scotland, as now degraded and enslaved by the State. And from this house—in which the prerogatives of our Great Head, and the rights and privileges of his members have been ignominiously trodden in the dust, we go forth as freemen of the Lord—free citizens of the freest Commonwealth on earth—joyfully to do homage to our glorious King, seated, in unrivalled supremacy, on the ancient throne of His own Kingdom and free dominion. So saying, forth proceeded,—amid the solemn silence and unbroken stillness, that indicate the mighty throb and swell of inward emotion, too big for utterance ;—forth proceeded, from the desecrated and desolated sanctuary of an Establishment, once the nation's chiefest glory and renown ;—forth proceeded, the representatives of Scotland's piety and Scotland's patriotism—the representatives of Scotland's covenanted faith and Scotland's moral worth—the representatives of Scotland's unshaken loyalty to Zion's King, and Scotland's undying attachment to Zion's cause ;—forth they proceeded, amid the brightest gleams and sunshine of heavenly favour and the richest showers of heavenly blessing ;—forth they proceeded, to lay the foundation—firm and indestructible as the Rock of Ages on which it is based—the foundation, of **THE FREE PROTESTING CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.**

Having now brought down my meagre outline sketches, to the point

and date of actual disruption, I might begin to expatiate on the wondrous and soul-stirring proceedings of the *first* General Assembly of the *Free Church* of Scotland; and contrast these with the nauseous and heart-sickening proceedings of the *first* General Assembly of the *Residuary* and *Erastianized* Church of Scotland. I might also expatiate on the vastness, the comprehensiveness, the wisdom, and the giant energy of the subsequent actings of the Free Church—their prospective influence on all the social, political, and religious institutions of the Empire—their out-spreading influence on all the National Churches of Christendom—and their ulterior influence on the kindreds and tribes of every realm of heathenism. But, as these would furnish ample themes for more than one separate Lecture; and as my more immediate object has been, simply to exhibit, both abstractly and historically, the great principles, the maintenance of which led to the disruption itself—I must here, for the present, pause.

I cannot, however, close, without first addressing a few parting words to different classes of individuals, who may be supposed to have formed a part of the large and respectable audiences that have now for the *fourth* time assembled in this Hall.

*First*, are there any of the careless and indifferent here, who, in sheer uninquiring, unexamining ignorance, and with characteristic levity, pass by the whole subject, with the trite, the puerile, the inane remark ;—"Oh, these men are innovators and schismatics; and this is another new sect and schism that has sprung up amongst us!" Truly, if we are innovators and schismatics, it is in a goodly and a glorious society. With the same kind of persons, who so treat us and our cause, the Blessed Saviour and his disciples were innovators and schismatics in their day. With the same kind of persons, who so treat us and our cause, Wickliffe and his disciples, Luther and his disciples, were the greatest innovators and schismatics, in their day. Poor, blinded, unhappy men! They little know the designs and purposes of the Almighty in reference to the world which they inhabit! It is a world lying in wickedness. And the very object of the Redemptive Economy is, to sever, or separate, or bring out of it, "a peculiar people, zealous of good works." It is, therefore, by a series, or successive variety of separations, secessions, dissections, or schisms, if you will, from a doomed and accursed world, that the Lord is calling out his elect people, and constituting, building up, extending, enlarging and perpetuating his redeemed and ransomed Church. And when the Church relapses into, and again amalgamates with, the world—a world that is at enmity with God,—contracting the taint of its spirit, and the infection of its principles,—what remains, but that there should be a vigorous renewal of the old wholesome process of separation, secession, dissection, or schism?—Either this, or increasing stagnation, corruption, and death! And thus by successive separations,—which, in such a case, is only another name for successive *reformations*—reformation itself constantly needing to be reformed—the purified portions of the Church Catholic will eventually be fitted

for coalescing, not by way of co-operation merely, but also, incorporation, into the one grand and undivided Church of Millennial glory.

*Second.* Are there those present who are sound in the great fundamentals of the faith, and fervent in love to our common Lord and Saviour—yet belonging to different visible denominations in the Christian Church? Dear Brethren, Spake I not truly, when, at the outset, I declared that the principles for which the Church of Scotland had so strenuously contended, were not local as to their sphere of operation, or subordinate as to their degree of relative importance? The ground on which the contest has been maintained may be Scotch; the particular shape and outward form assumed by it, with many of the accessories and accompaniments and immediate interests involved, may be Scotch. But the principles themselves are not Scotch; neither are they European or African, Asiatic or American. They are essentially catholic or universal, because they are eternal and divine. As to their importance—who can measure it? The central point around which they all cluster and revolve is none other than the sole and Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus over his own Church, and over *all* things to the Church! And in that single Doctrine, are there not, virtually wrapped up and embodied all the wonders of wisdom, mercy, and love, that constitute the adorable mystery of Redemption—a mystery, in which the glory of Jehovah shines forth with concentrated beauty and brightness? Here, then, dear friends, is a bond of union between us, stronger far than all mere affinities of outward form, or subscriptions to creeds and canons, or materialistic genealogies, or manual impositions, fabulously and scandalously misnamed Apostolic successions. These, in the hour of trial, will prove fragile and perishable, as the green withes in the hands of Samson. But, they who hold by the Head, having the vessel of their faith firmly moored to the Rock of Ages, can weather out every storm of conflicting moral elements. And the closer the union, and the more intense the devotion to the Great Head, the more vividly will be elicited the heaven-born sentiment of kindred and brotherhood among all the members. We may not be able, in all respects, to see, eye to eye. Many of you, for example, may not be able to approve of the strenuous endeavours, made for three hundred years by the Church of Scotland, to prove the *possibility* of a free and independent Church of Christ entering into friendly alliance with the Christian State, without thereby surrendering aught of its spiritual liberty and independence—a *possibility*, which, at different periods was not strenuously contended for merely, but *actually realized*, with triumphant success. But all of you, with one heart and one soul, must approve of the noble determination, that, rather than surrender the rights and liberties of a Church of Christ, there should be no such alliance at all—that, rather than brook the imposition of such dishonourable conditions after the alliance was formed, it should be severed, and the loss of all things cheerfully submitted to. The proclamation of this great resolve, amid sacrifices and performances on a scale of National magnitude, must prove the breaking down of another obstacle, and the strengthening of



another bond between myriads that were land-locked and spell-bound to their own separate little nook of the shore of truth's great ocean before. Still, we may not be able, in all respects, to see, eye to eye. How could this be reasonably expected? The present is but the time for busily preparing the materials, out of which shall be ultimately reared the universal temple of the latter day glory. "While the temple of the Lord of old was building," as one, whose style will soon betray him, has remarked, "some cutting, some squaring the marble, others hewing the cedars," how irrational the sort of men, "who could not consider there must be many schisms and many dissections made in the quarry and in the timber, ere the House of God can be built! And when every stone is laid artfully together, it cannot be united into a continuity, it can only be contiguous in this world: neither can every piece of the building be of one form; nay rather, the perfection consists in this, that out of many moderate varieties and brotherly dissimilitudes, that are not vastly disproportional, arises the goodly and the graceful symmetry, that commends the whole pile and structure." Though, therefore, we may not as yet, in all respects, see eye to eye, oh, let us through grace be ever growing in devotedness to our common Head! And, in very proportion as we do so, we shall be growing in heart-affection towards one another. And the sounding of our bowels in sympathy, and the kindling of our hearts in love,—swifter than all the flashings of human eloquence, and more potent far than all the artillery of the schools,—will, in the end, be sure to carry the citadel of the understanding, correct all errors of judgment, and sweep away all minor differences, varieties, and even brotherly dissimilitudes into the depths of the sea.

*Third.* Are there those present who still adhere to the once gloriously free, but now state-enslaved and degraded Church Establishment of Scotland? Friends and fellow countrymen! Allow me, in the spirit of that freedom which has for ages been transmitted to us from sire to son—and yet a freedom tempered with Christian love—to expostulate with you. "Situated as we are," you are reported to say, "at the distance of half the globe from home, we cannot see how the disruption of the Church *there*, can affect us, *here*." Is it worthy of the characteristic and proverbial sagacity of Scotchmen to talk after this sort? If it had been a local, isolated, physical event, which hardly affected even the *temporal* interests of a single proprietor, and his *spiritual* and *eternal* interests *not at all*,—such as the disruption or falling down of the great rock of the Fall of Fyers,—the disruption or cleaving asunder of Ben Nevis by an earthquake—you would scarcely talk thus. But what shall we say, when the disruption is that of by far the greatest, the mightiest, and incomparably the most useful institution in the land—an institution, which for ages has been the source and springhead of its chiefest glory, prosperity, and renown—an institution, which shall be remembered when all the peerless scenery of that "land of the mountain and the flood" shall be forgotten—an institution, which shall still survive in its fruits, when that immortal hope, which it hath breathed into each one of its

faithful children, shall be seen lighting its torch at Nature's funeral pile !

If tidings had been brought you, from the other end of the earth, of some mighty city being laid in ashes, amid the flames of an all-devouring conflagration ; of the inhabitants of another, pining away into skeletons, amid the gnawings of famine, or instantly shrivelling as in the grasp of corruption, amid the ravages of plague or pestilence ;—would you not be ashamed to refuse your aid and sympathy, on the plea, that these calamities, on account of their distance, did not physically affect you ? Or, if tidings were brought you, that a once free and independent state had been suddenly bereft of its liberties by a usurping tyrant, or that a state long enthralled had suddenly burst its chains, and gloriously asserted its intelligence and its freedom ;—would you not be ashamed to refuse your sympathy or gratulation, on the plea, that the success of freedom's cause in the one case, and the defeat of freedom's cause in the other, on account of the distance, did not physically affect you ? Oh, yes, I believe you would be ashamed so to act. Yea more, I shall believe you to be incapable of so acting. I know my country, and have studied the character of my countrymen, and I must say this, that it is not the nature of the genuine sons of Scotia, to refuse aid, or sympathy, or gratulation, when the weal or the woe, the joys or the sorrows of their fellow creatures, are deeply concerned—as if the affections and the feelings of catholic humanity had their circumscribed limits and boundaries like the territories of worldly states and empires ! And pleas, which ye repudiate in the lesser sphere, will ye tolerate or sanction in the greater ? Will ye hear of the National Church, not of a foreign realm, but of your own father-land,—a Church, in the bosom of which ye have been nursed, and nourished, and trained up into substantial moral worth and manly excellence—being rent into twain, not by the explosion of mere physical elements, but by the mighty and irrepressible energy of her own divine and undying principles ;—and will ye allow the remark to pass current in your name, that the event does not affect you ? It cannot be. The great struggle, which lately issued in this momentous event, was a mightier one far than that of the Bruce of Bannockburn, for the rights of his own Crown and the civil liberties of his own people. It was a struggle, for the supremacy of the Lord Jesus Christ—the Great Head of the Church, the sole Lord of conscience, and King of kings,—over every idol that would usurp his throne, and every rival that would contest his dominion—with all the spiritual rights and privileges flowing from Him, as sole Head and King. And it matters nought, in point of principle, whether the idol—the rival—be the shapeless block of a barbarous idolatry, or the ideal creation of a cultivated fancy, or the usurping decree of a sovereign state, or the judicial sentence of a civil tribunal. The faithful in the Church of Scotland, in so nobly contending for the prerogatives of their heavenly King, and the blood-bought liberties of his people, have called forth an echoing response from the faithful in all lands ;—and will ye, their

friends and countrymen, and fellow members in Church communion, refuse sympathetically to join the choral song? Have they exhibited a spectacle of faith, and grace, and wisdom, and vigour, and self-denial, such as the world has not witnessed for many an age;—and will ye refuse your joyous, your approving acclaim? Have they resisted the encroachments of the civil power; spurned away from them the bribes and temptations of civil immunities; cast off the old and wrinkled skin of a corrupt, debased, Erastranized Establishment; flung themselves into the lap of Providence; and thus perpetuated under the name of the Free Church, in all its pristine simplicity and integrity, the ancient veritable Church of Scotland—the very Church which was founded by Scotland's undaunted Reformers—fed and nourished by Scotland's holiest Confessors—and cemented by the blood of Scotland's noble army of martyrs;—and will ye refuse to cast off the same old and wrinkled skin of corruption too, and unite yourselves with the free, the fearless, and the brave, who have so dearly proved, that they inherit the spirit of the ancient worthies, and have so nobly earned for themselves and their country immortal renown? To be linked with a State-ridden and enslaved Establishment, is not only to be linked with dishonour, but with corruption and death. To be linked with a State-emanipated and Free Church is to be linked, not only with glory and honour, but with reviviscence and immortal youth! Who can behold the spirit, and the energy, and the mighty doings of the Free Church of Scotland, within the last few months, without being re-assured, that the Church of Christ is not yet wholly worn out or effete—that, in some of its leading members, the life-blood is still fresh, and the spirits pure and vigorous? Do not her movements, instead of betokening the wrinkled feebleness of decrepitude and decay, resemble those of a giant awakening out of sleep? To her, as one of the freest and noblest of Christian commonwealths, may we not, at this moment, worthily apply the sublime language of Milton, in reference to his own favourite civil commonwealth?—"Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks: methinks I see her as an eagle muing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full mid-day beam; purging and unscaling her long abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble, would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms."

*Fourth.* Are there those present, who have resolved to sever their connection with an establishment which,—to use the emphatic words of Her Majesty's Principal Home Secretary of State, in a late debate in the House of Commons,—“has made its *submission*”—submission to what or to whom?—to the word of God or to the Lord Jesus, the Great Head and King of the Church?—no—no;—but submission (oh, insufferable insult to the memory of Reformers, Confessors, and Martyrs! oh, ineffable dishonour to the prerogatives of the Lord of Glory!)

—"submission, to the supremacy of the State and the power of the Civil Tribunals !" To you I address a few words—to cheer, to comfort, to strengthen.

The *position* which we now occupy may be a *difficult* one, and we may not well see how we are most effectually to maintain it. But the real question is not, whether our position be a difficult one, but whether it be one into which we have been driven by the force of circumstances over which we had no control—whether it be one, into which we have been carried by the stream and current of an overruling Providence—whether it be one, which we cannot abandon, without an abandonment of principles, which we hold most sacred, as the very hinges on which the scheme of Redemption itself turns? If so, let us banish, at once and for ever, all consideration of difficulties ; let us remember, that it is our part, as good soldiers of the cross, not to choose, but cheerfully to occupy the post, which the Great Captain of our Salvation chooses for us. The more difficult the post appointed us, let us only esteem it the higher honour ;—for who ever heard of the craven coward, or the man of doubtful loyalty, being selected by a skilful Commander for the post of danger? And if ours be that post, let us, under the covert of Jehovah's wings and the canopy of his grace, still cling to it ; and be very sure, that, in the end, the post of danger will be found the post of honour, aye, and the post of safety too !

The *principles* which we uphold may *not be popular*. They may not be in accordance with the prevalent tone and temper of society around us. They may rouse no slumbering energies into excitement. They may call forth no shouts, no hosannahs of applause. But, has it not ever been so, with great and important spiritual truths? Have these not always, in the first instance, been hooted and scouted out of the society and fellowship of the myriads of this world's children? Are our principles more unpopular now, than were those of Abraham among the inhabitants of Canaan? And yet, these ultimately became rooted in the soil. Are our principles more distasteful to the great and the mighty now, than were those of Moses to the Court of Egypt? And yet, resistance to these covered the land with unheard of plagues,—smote down the pride of her ancient glory, and shattered to pieces the spirit of her people. Are they more obnoxious to the men of wealth, and influence, and power, and respectable religionism now, than were those of the blessed Saviour to the *élite* of this world, who alternately rioted in the festive halls of the cities of Judah, and worshipped ostentatiously amid the splendour and magnificence of the temple ritual in Jerusalem? And yet, the rejection of these swept Judah and Jerusalem with the besom of destruction—and, scourged and crucified on Calvary, they mounted the throne and swayed the sceptre of universal empire, in the city of the Cæsars.

We may be *comparatively poor, without influence and despised*. But, let us remember that the master whom we serve is rich—yea, hath the riches of the universe at his command ;—and that he may graciously design to employ our poverty for making many rich. He

is almighty too. All power in heaven and on earth is given to him. He hath the resources of the universe under his control. And it may be his sovereign will purposely to choose the weak things of the world to confound those that are mighty. He is the fount of all honour and glory too. And if, in this wilderness state, he call us to witness for him and his cause, in sackcloth and ashes,—it is, that we may shine the brighter and feel the happier, when new-clad with the pure and pearly robes of immortality.

We may be *few in number*. But, what are numbers with Him, whose will is power, and whose purpose is resistless energy? What were numbers, when three hundred men with trumpets and broken pitchers routed the countless hosts of Midian? What were numbers, when the dauntless Elijah stood alone,—confronted—and confounded hundreds of the Priests of Baal and of the groves? What were numbers, when, amid the assembled princes, counsellors, captains, governors, and multitudes of Babylon, the three children came forth from the seven times heated furnace unscathed, and the solitary prophet from the ravening lions' den unhurt? What were numbers, when twelve poor, powerless, and illiterate fishermen went forth in triumph to invade the gigantic idolatries, and the multitudinous superstitions of the nations? What were numbers, when a Luther or a Knox stood alone before monarchs and nobles, and other hostile and exasperated Potentates of the Earth? Let us, then, neither be daunted nor dismayed, because of the smallness of our number, or the greatness of that of our enemies. Like the servant of Elisha, when he saw "an host encompassing the city with horses and chariots," we may be tempted to cry out, "Alas, my master! how shall we do!" But the voice of a greater than the servant's master, will soon be heard saying, "Fear not; for they that be with you are more than they that be with them." And though we may not behold either mountain or plain literally filled with horses of fire or chariots of fire, we may be very sure that the protection given to the prophet,—all unnoticed and unknown, though it was, by the mighty hosts of Syria,—will be extended to God's faithful people throughout all ages and in all climes.

Our *prospects may seem dark and lowering*. So it has ever been with God's own people, immediately before great and signal deliverances. On the borders of the Red Sea, with naked precipitous mountains on either side; an herbless and waterless desert beneath and round about them; the chariots and horsemen of Egypt's proud monarch behind; and the deep swelling waves of the Red Sea before;—the panic-struck and disheartened multitudes, in weakness or want of faith, might cry out. "Is not this the word that we did tell thee in Egypt?" And, under the influence of distrustful unbelieving fear, they might add, "Let us alone that we may serve the Egyptians." So, under the pressure of encompassing difficulties;—the mighty of the land frowning down upon us—the little of the land doing their little all to refuse us a resting place—the hosts of Cæsar's satellites pursuing behind—and the waves and billows of an uncharted, unfathomed sea roaring before;—the faint-hearted may be tempted to raise the craven

cry, "Was not this the word that we did tell thee ;—let us alone that we may serve the Erastians." But our answer is that of Jehovah himself, "Speak unto the people that ye go forward." And if, in the strength of faith, forward we shall go—ours will be a safe passage and joyous out-gate, alike from the hosts of the pursuer, and the Red Sea of all our difficulties ;—and, on the further bank of the floods of great waters, shall we have one day to stand still,—and wonder and adore, when we behold the salvation of our God.

And, oh, that the Lord would rend his heavens, and come down, as in the days of old ! Then, would the mountains of all our fears, and dangers, and difficulties, melt away, even as the wax melteth before the fire. Then, would we learn, that those agitations in the social and moral world, which are now so apt to fill us with alarm, like storms and tempests in the circling atmosphere, while they shake and convulse, tend mightily to purify—by sweeping away the festering feculence of stagnation, corruption, and death ! "Come, then," let us say, in the language of the sublimest of uninspired men, "come, O thou, the ever-begotten Light and image of the Father, and intercede for us ! For, thou hast opened our difficult and sad times, and given us an unexpected breathing after all our oppressions. Thou hast taught us to admire only that which is good, and to count that only praiseworthy, which is grounded upon thy divine precepts. Thou hast made our false prophets to be a lie in the sight of all the people, and chased them with sudden confusion and amazement, before the redoubted brightness of thy descending cloud, that now covers thy tabernacle. Who is there that cannot trace thee now in thy beamy walk through the midst of thy sanctuary, amidst those golden candlesticks, which have long suffered a dimness amongst us through the violence of those that had seized them, and were more taken with the mention of their gold than of their starry light ; teaching the doctrine of Balaam, to cast a stumbling block before thy servants, commanding them to eat things sacrificed to idols, and forcing them to fornication ? Come, therefore, O thou that hast the seven stars in thy right hand, appoint thy chosen priests, according to their orders and courses of old, to minister before thee, and duly to press and pour out the consecrated oil into thy holy and ever-burning lamps. Thou hast sent out the spirit of prayer upon thy servants over all the land to this effect, and stirred up their vows as the sound of many waters about thy throne. Every one can say, that now certainly thou hast visited this land, and hast not forgotten the utmost corners of the earth, at a time when men had thought, that thou wast gone up from us to the farthest end of the heavens, and hadst left to do marvellously among the sons of these last ages. O perfect and accomplish thy glorious acts ! for men may leave their works unfinished, but thou art a God, thy nature is perfection. Thou canst vouchsafe to us, though unworthy, as large a portion of thy spirit as thou pleasest ; for who shall prejudice thy all-governing will ? seeing the power of thy grace is not passed away with the primitive times, as fond and faithless men imagine, but thy kingdom is now at hand, and thou standing at the door. Come forth

out of thy Royal chambers, O Prince of all the Kings of the earth ! put on the visible robes of thy imperial majesty ; take up that unlimited sceptre, which thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed thee ;—for now the voice of thy Bride calls thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed.”

## II.—THE SCHOOLMASTERS OF SCOTLAND.

What Scotsman feels not interested, warmly and sincerely interested, in that useful and honoured class, the PAROCHIAL SCHOOL-MASTERS OF SCOTLAND ? Next to the parochial ministry, they have contributed to the moral and spiritual welfare of our native land—nay, more, out of them has arisen a very large proportion of those, who are now ministers of the Gospel in that much favoured country. The School-Masters of Scotland have now to pass through the same salutary, but painful process of sifting, with her ministers ; many of them have joined themselves to the Free Church, and the Residuary Presbyteries have discovered, and are now acting on the discovery, that such men are liable to the process of ejection, subject to the penalties of ecclesiastical secession. This was of course to be expected by all who were acquainted with the nature of the Scottish parochial Establishment ; so admirably was it in former days cemented, that now when destroyed, it comes not down in pieces, but in *masses*—so that the strength which was the glory of the structure, is the glory also of the ruins. The best of the SCHOOL-MASTERS, and it may be also of its collegiate PROFESSORS, will now be sifted out into the FREE CHURCH ; and under its superintendence, many of them will carry on their former most honourable and useful vocation :—but, in the meanwhile, at an immense temporal *sacrifice*—for, as yet, no definite provision has been made for them, nor could be ; save only, we believe, in the case of School-Masters, a share of the collection made each Lord’s-day. The paper subjoined will, we doubt not, be interesting to many of our readers ; it is descriptive of the case submitted by the School-Masters for legal advice, and of the counsel given them in return. This apparent evil, the ejection of so many worthy teachers, the Lord will overrule for good—a good which will yet be most manifest : but in the meanwhile it is encompassed with sore pains and trials.

### PAROCHIAL SCHOOLMASTERS.

#### *Case for the Opinion of Counsel.*

A. B., parochial schoolmaster of the parish of C., was a candidate for that office in the year 1828. After undergoing the necessary examination by the Presbytery of the bounds, upon the branches of literature required by the heritors and minister, and his certificates and recommendations in his favour

having been found perfectly satisfactory, he was, after having signed the Confession of Faith, and the Formula of the Church of Scotland, binding himself to submission to the government of the Church as by law established, unanimously admitted to the office. He immediately entered upon his duties, and has taught a numerous school, to the satisfaction of the Presbytery, and also of the parents of the children.

A. B. always sat in the Established Church of the parish of C., and was a communicant there till the late disruption in the Establishment. He now adheres to, and is member of, the Free Church of Scotland. He was lately summoned to appear before the Presbytery of the bounds, to answer the question, whether or not he has seceded from the Establishment. He did not attend, being desirous, in the first place, to be advised as to his legal rights, and in the meanwhile, a Committee of the Presbytery has been appointed to deal with him.

In requesting the opinion of counsel, he begs to refer them to the following acts of Parliament, as bearing on the questions to be submitted.

By statute 1690, cap. 17, which proceeds on the preamble that, considering how necessary it is "that the universities, colleges, and schools, be provided and served with pious, able, and qualified professors, principals, regents, masters, and others, bearing office therein, *well affected to their Majesties, and the established government of Church and State,*" it is enacted, that "from this time forth no professors, principals, regents, masters, or others, bearing office in any university, college, or school, within this kingdom, *be either admitted or allowed to continue in the exercise of their said functions, but such as do acknowledge and profess, and shall subscribe to, the Confession of Faith,* ratified and approved by this present Parliament, and also swear and subscribe the oath of allegiance to their Majesties; and withal shall be found to be of a pious, loyal, and peaceable conversation, and good and sufficient literature and abilities for their respective employments, *and submitting to the government of the Church now settled by law.*"

It will be observed, that the qualifications required by his statute apply equally to principals and professors in universities, as to masters of schools.

By the act 1693, cap. 22, it is enacted, "that all *schoolmasters* and teachers of youth in *schools*, are and shall be *liable to the trial, judgment, and censure of the Presbyteries of the bounds*, for their sufficiency, qualifications, and deportment in the said office."

This provision again, it will be seen, is limited to the case of "schoolmasters and teachers of youth in schools."

Farther, by the Act of Security, embodied in the Treaty of Union, it is specially enacted, "for the greater security of the foresaid Protestant religion, and of the worship, discipline, and government of this Church, as above established,"—"that the Universities and Colleges of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Edinburgh, as now established by law, shall continue within this kingdom for ever, and that in all time coming, no *professors, principals, regents, masters, or others bearing office in any university, college, or school*, within this kingdom, be capable, or be admitted, or allowed to continue in the exercise of their said functions, but such as shall own and acknowledge the civil government in manner prescribed, or to be prescribed, by the acts of Parliament; as also, that *before, or at their admissions*, they do and shall acknowledge and profess, and shall subscribe to the *foresaid Confession of Faith, as the confession of their faith, and that they practise and conform themselves to the worship presently in use in this Church, and submit themselves to the government and discipline thereof*, and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion of the same, and that before the respective Presbyteries of their bounds, by whatever gift, presentation, or provision they may be hereto provided."



The attention of counsel is respectfully requested to the difference of phraseology in this act in regard to the subscription of the oath of allegiance, and that of the confession and submission to the Church government, and also to the fact, that it makes one general enactment for professors and schoolmasters.

There is no other act affecting the status of teachers of youth, until the 43d Geo. III. cap. 54. By the 16th section of this act it is enacted, that the schoolmaster shall take the minutes of his election to the Presbytery, with attestations of his having taken the oath of allegiance, and the Presbytery "shall thereupon take trial of his sufficiency for the office, in respect of morality and religion, and of such branches of literature as by the majority of heritors and ministers shall be deemed most necessary and important for the parish, by examination of the presentee, by certificates and recommendations in his favour, by their own personal inquiry or otherwise, and *shall see him* sign the Confession of Faith, and Formula of the Church of Scotland." It is then provided that the Presbytery being satisfied of the qualifications of the person elected, a minute shall be written out, an extract of which shall complete the schoolmaster's right to the emoluments of the office.

Under this act, no change whatever is made in the law relating to Professors in Universities. The law regarding them remains as it was enacted in the Act of Security. The law relating to schoolmasters is ratified and confirmed by the Act 1803, *so far as not altered by that act.*

In addition to these statutes, the attention of counsel is directed to the case of *Murray v. Donaldson, &c.*, decided by the Second Division of the Court in 1834. The schoolmaster in that case had never signed the Confession of Faith, and the judgement of the Court therefore seems not applicable to the circumstances of the present; but the opinions of the Judges, and especially of the Lord Ordinary (Jeffrey), bear on the general question, as to which the memorialist is anxious to obtain the opinion of counsel.

It is well known, that in accordance with a practice of long standing, there are several professors in the Scottish Universities, who are not members of the Established Church, although the statutes above quoted seem to require the same qualification as to the matter in question, in the case of professors, as in that of schoolmasters. So far as the memorialists are aware, however, the case of Professor Blackie of Aberdeen presents the only instance in which any question has arisen in the courts of law, as to the provisions of the above recited statutes in regard to professors in universities. That case was decided by the Lord Ordinary on a question of title, and the reclaiming note against his interlocutor was withdrawn. The printed papers are herewith sent, and counsel is respectfully requested to consider whether the circumstance of schoolmasters being declared subject to the judgment and censure of the Presbytery for their deportment in their office, while there seems no statutory enactment giving Presbyteries a superintendence over, or a power of deposing or otherwise censuring professors of universities, places the former in a different position from the latter, as to their continued submission to the government of the Church as by law established.

As formerly mentioned, the Presbytery, at the period of his admission, examined A. B., and found him fully qualified, and they have no ground of complaint against him, except that he adheres to the Free Church. He then signed the Confession of Faith. He also then signed the Formula of the Established Church, and if called upon again to sign the Confession of Faith, he is ready to do so. He is ready to subscribe the oath of allegiance again. He is ready to do everything that he did at his induction in 1828, except to sign the Formula.

In these circumstances, the opinion of counsel is requested on the following points :—

1st, Is the adherence of the memorialist to the Free Church, and his separation from the Establishment, an act on which the Presbytery could found a proceeding against him, as subjecting him to the judgment and censure of the Presbytery; and would they, in respect of it, be entitled to deprive him of his office?

2d, Can the memorialist be called upon by the Presbytery to subscribe a second time the Confession of Faith, and Formula of submission to the Church government of the Established Church; and in the event of his refusal, is he liable to be deprived of his office?

#### OPINION FOR A. B.

By the act 1690, c. 17, it is provided, that “from this time forth, no professors, principals, regents, masters, or other bearing office in any university, college, or school within this kingdom, be either admitted, or *allowed to continue* in the exercise of their said functions, *but such as do acknowledge and profess* and shall subscribe to the Confession of Faith, ratified and approved by this present Parliament; and also swear and subscribe the oath of allegiance to their Majesties, and withal shall be found to be of a pious, loyal, and peaceable conversation, and of good and sufficient literature and abilities for their respective employments, *and submitting to the government of the Church now settled by law.*”

Again, by the act 1693, c. 22, it is enacted, “that all schoolmasters and teachers of youth in schools are and shall be liable to the trial, judgment, and censure of the Presbyteries of the bounds, for their sufficiency, qualifications, and *deportment of the said office.*”

Farther, by the act for securing the Protestant religion and Presbyterian Church government, 1706, c. 6, afterwards embodied in the Treaty of Union, it is specially enacted, “for the greater security of the foresaid Protestant religion, and of the worship, discipline, and government of this Church as above established”—that, in all time coming no professors, principals, regents, masters, or others bearing office in any university, college, or school within this kingdom, be capable, or be admitted or allowed to continue in the exercise of their said functions, but such as shall own and acknowledge the civil government, in manner prescribed or to be prescribed, by the acts of Parliament; as also, that before or at their admissions, they do and shall acknowledge and profess, and shall subscribe to the foresaid Confession of Faith, as the confession of their faith, and that they will *practise and conform themselves to the worship* presently in use in this Church, *and submit themselves to the government and discipline* thereof, and never endeavour, directly or indirectly, the prejudice or subversion of the same; and that before the respective Presbyteries of their bounds, by whatsoever gift, presentation, or provision they may be thereto provided.”

Still farther, by the act 43, George III. c. 54, s. 16, the examination of parochial schoolmasters, with the view to admission to their office, is specially committed to the Presbytery, who are enjoined to “see him sign the Confession of Faith and Formula of the Church of Scotland.”

The Presbyteries of the Church of Scotland have constantly exercised the superintendence of parochial schoolmasters committed to them by these statutes, and such schoolmasters have in practice always been members of the Church.

Having in view these various enactments, and the uniform practice following on them, we cannot doubt that all parish schoolmasters must not only

be members of the Church of Scotland at the time of their admission, but must remain members, and be subject to the discipline, and acknowledge and obey the government, of the Church, during their continuance in office. Hence, we are of opinion that secession from the Established Church must necessarily disqualify a schoolmaster from continuing in his office, and that the Presbytery are entitled and bound to take all necessary steps for removing him in respect of the disqualification arising from such secession and discontinuance of subjection to the discipline and government of the Church. We think this falls within the policy and plain terms of the enactments, and has been confirmed by usage.

2. Some doubts may be, and we believe have been, entertained, how far the removal from office on account of secession can be accomplished by the Presbytery simply requiring the schoolmaster of new to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Formula. It may be said that the subscription of the Confession of Faith and Formula is merely a test required on admission, and is not necessary to be repeated. But we hold that the power in the Presbytery of demanding a renewal of the test, and an acknowledgment of subjection to the Church on any fitting occasion, such as an open or even an apparent secession, is implied in the duty imposed upon them of seeing that the schoolmasters shall continue obedient to the discipline and laws of the Church. We also think that the decision, and more particularly the opinions of the Judges in the case of *Murray v. Donaldson*, substantially support the view that the Presbytery have the power, on proper and adequate occasion, to require the test of again subscribing the Confession of faith and Formula, to the effect of showing that the schoolmasters continue members of the Church and subject to its government. Being clear that the power of deposition on account of secession is necessarily vested in the Presbytery, we hold that they must be entitled to remove seceding schoolmasters from office. Indeed, according to our view of the matter, schoolmasters seceding from the Church have no more right to continue in their situations than the parish ministers who have followed the same course.

The opinion of

(Signed)

PAT. ROBERTSON.  
GEO. GRAHAM BELL.

Edinburgh, 15th July, 1843.

On a similar case the following opinion was given by Messrs. Rutherford and Dunlop :—

We are of opinion that, in the event of any proceedings being instituted against schoolmasters adhering to the Free Church, they will have no valid defence against sentence of deprivation being pronounced.

The opinion of

(Signed)

AND. RUTHERFURD.  
A. DUNLOP.

Edinburgh, June 3, 1843.

### III.—THE STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE FREE CHURCH AT HOME.

(IN A LETTER FROM A FRIEND.)

[*The communication here presented to our readers is one of some value. The writer of it, as will be perceived, is a man of amiable and intelligent mind;—he is also a gentleman of good professional standing;—and withal a well-read, well instructed Christian. He was brought up in “Moderate” principles, and until lately was of views opposite to those which he now so ably maintains. He is now alone in his family-connexion, for it adheres to the Residuary establishment; but he is happy in his convictions of truth and duty, for he has obeyed his conscience and his Bible, as he has felt the one, and understood the other. The local references may be more interesting to some, and the general views which are presented, to others—but we trust the communication as a whole will be serviceable to all that portion of Christ’s Church with which it is our happy lot to identify our little labour of love. The letter is made public, without breach of confidence, or doubt of acceptance.*]

A——, July 20, 1843.

I feel it, *now* that my former difficulty is removed, a pleasure to write so candid and so willing a friend, and I can promise to endeavour at least to lay aside all asperity and prejudice in speaking of what has happened. This is very, very difficult; but I wish to do so, and the very resolution will help to expand my views in trying to communicate to one at so great a distance a fair outline of the past and present state of the Church *in this quarter*. I should be truly ashamed if I were to sit down and distort or conceal the truth (as I see it,) in offering this outline to you to whom I would feel gratified in giving some small aid in estimating the position of Scotland. I will confine myself, as before, chiefly to this locality. But let me say first how entirely I agree (it is impossible not to do so) in the propriety of your judgment as to your keeping aloof from the strife until the decision is *forced* upon you. I will not even speculate on your decision. And I no wise understand you to be concurring in my views, however I may express myself in speaking frankly my own opinions of men and measures.

Well, you must suppose the disruption over, and all the Ministers of A—— to have left the Established Church as they said they would. The six town ministers, and the ten ministers of *quoad sacra* churches in new and old A——, have all come out, the only case in any of the large cities of Scotland. But what, you say, of their people? Their secession too is more complete than we at first hoped, or our opponents feared. In all the *quoad sacra* churches, without exception, the number who remain in the Church is hardly worth naming; in the N—— P—— Church, about 100 seats only are taken; in G—— almost none; in the east and south, the largest in town, not

one-third; the West, which is the fashionable Church, alone retains nearly its former numbers, made up however in a great measure of the adherents to the establishment in all the *quoad sacra* churches. Dr. B—— of M—— C—— has also resigned, to the great gratification of all here who belong to the Free Church, which his high character will greatly tend to strengthen. The people of the different congregations look to him (I have always done so) with a particular reverence, derived from his understood erudition, amiability and personal worth. He had never taken any active part in the proceedings before the disruption, nor even attended the Church Courts; and hence his adherence marks more significantly his calm and unbiassed judgment of the question. Dr. B—— of M—— has also adhered; Dr. D——, who made warm professions up to the decisive moment, and even went to one or two of the sittings of the Free Assembly (he was not a member), is now standing between both parties, communicating with the Free Church, and preaching in the pulpits of the Establishment. He has not showed himself here since the Assembly.

One of the most grievous of all possible events would have been, the dereliction of character and principle by these Ministers whom we had been wont to look up to. But thanks to God, grace guiding them, we have not this to mourn over in our quarter. All our good men have proved to be true men, and are now confessors for their principles. True, some of the loudest declaimers at Church Courts have lost courage and staid in. I may mention as a matter of curiosity, to you at a distance, in case you know them—Mr. Imray of Longside, Cumming of Fraserburgh, Cordiner of Forgeue, Mackenzie of Skene,—and oh shame to say! one Minister has accepted a presentation to a parish close to his present one, vacated by a brother presbyter of his own. But the Moderates themselves are ashamed of such accessions, which only weaken the Institution they hang on to. All those, I repeat, who were before *felt* by discerning on-lookers to be no fair weather sailors, sporting a popular harangue, but to hold a deep conviction of the weight of the questions at stake,—all those have gladdened our hearts by making this noble, this unparalleled sacrifice. You may know some of them;—Garioch of Old Meldrum, the two brothers Henry and David Simson of Oyne and Chapel of Garioch, Simpson of Kintore, Anderson of Saint Fergus, Ferguson of Strachan (a son of the old Minister of Marytown, himself a Seceder.) In some of these cases, the sacrifice is greater than in others. In one of them, (Anderson's of Saint Fergus near Peterhead) the party has a very large family; he will not have a site allowed him even for himself; and I am told it had been intimated to him by a rich father (he is an only son) that disinheritance would be his lot if he came out. In another case, (and this is not uncommon) the Minister has to bring the partner and soother of his cares, and a family of nine children (I speak of Henry Simpson of Chapel of Garioch) into Aberdeen, while he remains working in his parish, living in a small house of two rooms. And all this, my dear

friend, with a calmness of piety and resignedness that in my eye is the very essence of the Christian sublime. I was, a few days ago, at the Manse of S——, Mr. Ferguson's, where as yet he remains; for his patron Sir Jas. Carnegie knows his worth and his value among his humble and out-of-the-world parishioners, and is not to present till the last moment, so as to interfere as little as possible with his comforts. By the way, this was Dr. Bryce's parish: it is a wild, bare glen, between the Dee and Forfarshire, with no resident heritors, and where the present Minister by devotedness, piety, and knowledge of his people has gained all their hearts. He was always quiet and grave; but I thought I could see his gravity softened into more mildness than ever as he spoke of his arrangements, for his wife and family's future residence, with as simple and apparent unconsciousness as if he were not one to whom every Christian man in the world ought to doff his hat and open his heart; as if he had done nothing in leaving a place so endeared to him as this house must be. Every angry feeling seemed a stranger to him—and this, I verily believe, is a fair specimen of the country ministers generally who have come out.

It is a very difficult matter to estimate without prejudice the prospects of the Free Church here and through Scotland. Indeed it is perhaps impossible for any man as yet to take a perfectly wide and comprehensive view of its probable future history. Speaking for myself I cannot pretend to be clear of a good deal of bias affecting my judgment. But I think I can safely assert that so far from there being now any indisposition on the part of the people, anywhere, town or country, to give a fair hearing to our ministers, they are on the contrary very anxious to listen to them. Every exertion is used to supply from the large towns the demand for preaching in the districts where the parish ministers are against the Free Church. Thus the Presbytery of Alford, where not one went out, is placed under the care in the meantime of the Free Presbytery of Aberdeen; and I know that from most of its parishes urgent solicitations have been made for interim supplies of worship; that our town ministers, who are quite unwearied, have been listened to on their visits by attentive crowds, and that at the meeting of our Free Presbytery to-day, calls were laid before them already from two several parishes in that Moderate Presbytery in favor respectively of two of our probationers, attended with such encouraging circumstances, that no difficulty was held in sustaining these calls and resolving to proceed in the settlements. This I give as a proof, *a fortiori*, of the leaning of the bulk of the people in every other quarter where there are men of a fitting description to be sent among them, and my feeling certainly is that if our Church Courts had men and money enough to wield, they would have Scotland (generally speaking) taken out of the hands of the establishment. One reason for this is, that the history of the Church of Scotland has, since this great struggle began, and of late especially, been, I know, attracting the attention of all classes belonging to it: and the proceedings of the Church Courts before the disruption have, as I have often seen, been watched with the most lively interest. Now, as I believe, it is impossible to read the

history of our beloved Church from 1640 to 1689, without seeing the identity of the principle maintained by the evangelical party *now* with that for which our Martyrs from Guthrie to Renwick suffered, they testifying against the Erastianism of the Crown and the Privy Council, and we against the Erastianism of the Civil Courts, the sympathies and antipathies certain to arise from the perusal of *their* annals, were naturally transferred to the events and parties of the present contest ; and in this quarter, at least, I do not know any possessed of an intelligent acquaintance with our forefathers' contentings, or even with a sympathy for their sufferings, who are not supporters of the Free Church, as that which alone cherishes the principles of genuine Presbyterianism. Again, in trying to estimate the causes working in its favor, the position and character of its Ministers, as compared with those of the establishment, is very important. "How," said the Bishop of Chester the other day at the Pastoral and Society, "how is the established Church to combat the Dissenters—Out-do them, out-preach them, out-pray them?" Now, giving every credit to many admirable men who are no doubt still left behind, it cannot be fairly denied, that the Free Church has the advantage as a whole in these respects. I need not dwell on this: the very fact of their making the sacrifice, has raised them even in the eyes of the world, and given a favorable impression of them and their Church. One can hardly suppose a motive for a careless, secular-minded man acting such a part ; while we all see unfortunately, that many pretended Non-Intrusionists have stayed in, and injured the weight of the Church they adhere to. Besides, it is obvious, that notwithstanding all the reasons which require the Ministers of the establishment to follow Dr. Sumner's advice, they are, very many of them, not fitted by habit or disposition to do any such thing. Again a Presbyterian Church is in its essence a popular one ; but I regard, sincerely regard, the Free Church as having taken all that is truly Presbyterian away with it ; and besides it is plain, that the Moderate leaders (and Dr. Mearns especially who is and must be necessarily, I should say, *the* leader) wish to exclude all popular feeling and influence from blowing in upon them at all. They don't want the sympathies of the people, all their measures at last assembly show this ; they can stand, they think, on the support of the aristocracy, the landlords and the Crown's ministers, and I view it as part of their system, that they want the people not to interfere with their Church Courts one step farther than to perform the exact functions which their rigid rules prescribe. I don't know Dr. Cook, whose policy besides is not so transparent ; but one sees even in him no proof of enlightenment on the necessity to a Presbyterian Church's safety of carrying popular respect and approval and interest with it. I am in no mistake as to the plain policy of our Aberdeen Moderates, whose *Euthanasia* would be a return to 1790. I know from good authority, that their proceedings at the Assembly startled and turned some of the best people in Edinburgh (by best I only mean some truly pious)—who, looking to Dr. Muir and Dr. Brunton, as representatives of Moderatism, had regarded it favorably,

but were repelled by its face as disclosed with an Aberdeen, ominous aspect.

Another fact of the most encouraging and delightful nature is the perfectly good understanding between us and the Evangelical Dissenters who, before the disruption, looked on our party with great jealousy. They distrusted our sincerity, and disliked the attempt to make the establishment really effective and popular. But now they have welcomed us everywhere with open arms, have given our congregations the free use of their Chapels till our new Churches are ready, and show themselves disposed to go hand in hand with us as friends and allies. In Aberdeen all our Seceding Ministers have the use of seceding or independent places of worship, which, I am glad to say, are inconveniently crowded. I have to-day been reading a sermon preached on occasion of the disruption by Mr. Kennedy, the most talented Independent Minister in Aberdeen (I only mention it as a sign of the times), in which speaking for himself and his brethren, he hails the Secession as the most auspicious event in modern religious history, does full justice to the Seceders, and promises to bury for ever all former quarrels and differences.

It is an event fraught with the most momentous consequences to the State as well as to society. I have left myself no room, nor have I inclination to speculate on these. I wish to give you facts only as they appear to me ; and I will state what occurs to me with regard to its effect on the establishment. One striking fact there is, the rapid spread of the belief that her fate is sealed, and the opinion that her doom is deserved. I have not spoken to any of those, who have left her, who does not hold these sentiments ; and their very prevalence, is a most alarming warning to her rulers, if they saw it. Farther, they don't see it ; they don't take any heed, seemingly, to the growing feeling of hostility to her—and they are most wantonly bringing her into collision with so many interests as greatly to increase that hostility. In the Assembly they cut themselves off again from communion with all other bodies of Christians, by restoring the Act of 1799 ; they have reverted to the former system of the exclusion of popular influence in the charge of Ministers, they have at once struck off the *quoad sacra* Ministers and Elders, and they evidently are ready to restore the close system in the election of Elders. In every way they can, they are running counter to the feeling of the present day ; and in an age when no institution can stand without public feeling and respect in its favor, they are narrowing their basis of support, and trusting entirely to that of the upper classes. But, more than this, they are making the establishment to be a practical grievance. They have laid it down as a rule, it is understood, that they will not suppress any one parish Church in a burgh, or elsewhere, however unnecessary now after the disruption. Thus, in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen, a third of the former number of Churches would answer for the adherents of the establishment ; and thus part of these, and of the other large towns, will be ruined by having to support the whole. This is heating the animosity of the large towns, no safe thing to



tamper with. Again look at the position of the Church, as to parish schools and universities. The Church Courts are resolved it seems to enforce rigidly, with respect to both, the adherence of the holders of office: they are taking steps to dispossess every parish schoolmaster, who joins the Free Church; and the University, and Presbytery of St. Andrew's, have actually applied to Government to aid them in ejecting Sir David Brewster on the same ground. The connection of these seminaries with the established Church went on well enough, while the latter was really the Church of the great majority, but even then it was held prudent to wink at the omission in many cases of eminent Professors as to enforcing their subscription to the *formula*. If it be attempted now, it must be carried out in the case of the Episcopalian Professors in Glasgow and Edinburgh—thus landing the Church in a dispute with their chief supporters; and even as to parish schoolmasters, I venture to think it doubtful, whether the system of confining their appointments to a comparatively small body, will be long submitted to without complaint. Practically the matter does come to this (which tho' obvious enough in Ireland, we did not see well before till it was brought home to us), that an established Church, if in a minority, is in a false and unsafe position; and the more so the more that it is attempted to bolster it by protections and monopolies. Another serious hardship arising out of the disruption, is the claim made by the established Presbyteries to retain the fabrics of the *quoad sacra* Churches, though Ministers, session and people have all gone out; thus compelling them to incur great expense in erecting new buildings, and even farther by their insisting on the managers continuing bound to pay stipend to the new ministers, whom the Presbyteries may put into these chapels, by their *jus devolutum*, failing appointments in terms of their constitutions.

I really find it irksome and painful to write of these things; I would far rather have laid them aside, and dwelt on the many hopeful prospects of the Free Church, and the energy and vigour with which it is prosecuting its evangelising course. But I wished to point out some *facts*, which though not pleasant to look at, it is well you should know; and if I can judge of myself I have done it without angry feeling towards the now-Established Church. I cannot pretend to like its constitution, and I think it is dissociated from every thing venerable or touching in its former history; but I would not misrepresent it. I will trouble you most likely with another letter very soon, and I conclude now with assuring you of my warm and affectionate regard, respect and sympathy;—you are in a difficult and important position—I have no fear, my dear friend, of the result. Ever most affectionately yours,

---

## IV.—EDINBURGH UNDER MODERATISM IN 1783.

*To the Editor of the Free Churchman.*

DEAR SIR,—I was lately reading Arnot's History of Edinburgh, a work interesting on many accounts, but chiefly as shewing the state of things in the metropolis of Scotland, just after the Act of 1712 had fairly begun to work, the Ministers who were appointed under the former system having died out, and the "Moderate ascendancy" being fully established. An appendix to the work consists of a contrast between Edinburgh in 1763 and Edinburgh in 1783. For a few extracts from this, with a few remarks upon them, I beg a small portion of your valuable space. It is not improbable that so striking an illustration of much that is now at work, may already have been quoted elsewhere, and for the same purpose—but I am not aware that it has—but, even if it had, that would only make the reference all the more striking. The extracts that most bear on the subject are these :—

"In 1783—Several Presbyterian ministers in Edinburgh, and Professors in the University, kept their own carriages; a circumstance, which, in a circumscribed walk of life as to fortune, does honour to the literary abilities of many of them, and is perhaps unequalled in any former period of the History of the Church of Scotland, or of the University.

In 1763—Literary property, or authors acquiring money by their writings, was hardly known in Scotland: David Hume and Dr. Robertson had, indeed, a few years before, sold some of their works; the one, a part of the History of Britain, for £200; the other, the History of Scotland, for £600—two vols. in quarto, each.

In 1783—The value of literary property was carried higher by the Scots than ever was known among any people. David Hume received £5000 for the remainder of his History of Britain; and Dr. Robertson, for his second work, received £4500. In sermon-writing, the Scots have also excelled; and although, in 1763, they were reckoned remarkably deficient in this species of composition, yet, in 1783, a minister in Edinburgh wrote the most admired sermons that ever were published, and obtained the highest price that ever was given for a work of the kind."

N. B. The merit of these Sermons obtained for Dr. Blair a pension of £200 per annum."

This extract distinctly fixes the time. It was the period when Robertson wrote and when Blair preached, and by his preaching introduced the soul-ruining habit of giving English Grammar instead of Scotch divinity, yea instead of the blessed gospel of Salvation. It was moreover the period when Ministers began to emulate the bearing of fine gentlemen, according to Witherspoon's sixth characteristic.

The next extract will be appreciated by those who have read the first volume of Sir Walter Scott's Life :—

"In 1763—There were no oyster cellars, or, if one, it was for the reception of the lowest rank.

In 1783—Oyster-cellars\* are numerous, and are become places of fashionable resort, and the frequent rendezvous of dancing parties, or private assemblies."

The following shews the effect of the English-Grammar preaching on the minds and characters of a highly important class of the community :—

"In 1763—The wages to maid-servants were, generally, from £3 to £4 4s. a-year. They dressed decently, in blue or red cloaks or plaids, suitable to their station.

In 1783—The wages are nearly the same, but the dress and appearance are greatly altered; the maid-servants being almost as fine in their dress as their mistresses were in 1763. They have now silk cloaks and caps, ribbons, ruffles, flounced petticoats, false hair, cork rumps, &c. Their *whole year's wages*, are insufficient for rigging out most of them for one Sunday or holiday. The manners and conversation of most of them are by no means suited to the improvement of the children of the families whom they serve."

The following extract is very long, but it is also very valuable. See, Mr. Editor, what small type can do, and try to put it in :—

"In 1763—It was the fashion for gentlemen to attend the drawing-rooms of the ladies in the afternoons, to drink tea, and to mix in the society and conversation of the women.

In 1783—The drawing-rooms are totally deserted; and the only opportunity gentlemen have of being in ladies' company, is when they happen to *mess* together at dinner or at supper; and even then an impatience is often shewn till the ladies retire. It would appear that the dignity of the female character, and\* the respect which it commanded, is considerably lessened, and that the bottle, and dissoluteness of manners, are heightened, in the estimation of the men.

In 1763—It was fashionable to go to church, and people were interested about religion. Sunday was strictly observed by all ranks as a day of devotion; and it was disgraceful to be seen on the streets during the time of public worship. Families attended church, with their children and servants; and family-worship was frequent. The collections at the church doors for the poor amounted yearly to £1500 and upwards.

In 1783—Attendance on church is much neglected: Sunday is made a day of relaxation: families think it ungenteeled to take their domestics to church with them; the streets are often crowded in the time of worship; and, in the evenings, they are often loose and riotous. Family-worship is almost totally disused; and it is even wearing out among the clergy: the collections at the church doors for the poor have fallen to £1000. So that, with more people, and more money, the collections at the church doors are lessened near £600 a-year.

It may be mentioned here, as a curious fact, that, for more than half of this century, one of the smallest churches in Edinburgh† has collected more money for the poor, at the time of dispensing the sacrament, than eight churches did upon the same occasion in 1783.

In no respect are the manners of 1763 and 1783 more remarkable than in the modesty, decency, reserve, dignity, and delicacy, of the one period, compared with the looseness, dissipation, forwardness, freedom, and licentious-

\* Or taverns taking that name.  
† The Tolbooth Church.

ness, of the other. People now seem to cease to blush at what would formerly have been reckoned a crime.

In 1763—The breach of the seventh commandment was punished by fine and church-censure. Any instance of conjugal infidelity in a woman would have banished her from society, and her company would have been rejected even by the men.

In 1783—Although the law punishing adultery with death stands unrepealed yet even church-censure is disused, and separations, divorces, recriminations, collusions, separate maintenances, are become frequent. Women who have been rendered infamous by public divorce, have been permitted to marry the adulterer; and it is not without example, that the known adulteress has been, by some people of fashion, again received into society, notwithstanding the endeavours of our worthy Queen to check such a violation of morality, decency, the laws of the country, and the rights of the virtuous.

In 1763—The fines collected by the kirk-treasurer for bastard children amounted to £154; and, upon an average of ten succeeding years, they were £190.

In 1733—The fines for bastard children amounted to £600.

N. B. It is to be remarked, that the repentance stool, and church-censure, have been several years disused.

In 1763—The clergy visited, catechised, and instructed the families within their respective parishes, in the principles of morality, Christianity, and the relative duties of life.

In 1783—Visiting and catechising are disused, except by one or two of the clergy: if people do not choose to go to church, they may remain as ignorant as Hottentots, and the Ten Commandments be as little known as rescinded acts of parliament.—Religion is the only tie that can restrain, in any degree, the licentiousness of the vulgar; when that is lost, ferocity of manners, and every breach of morality may be expected.

Hoc fonte derivata clades  
In patriam populumque fluxit.

In 1763—Masters took charge of their apprentices, and kept them under their eye in their own houses.

In 1783—Few masters will receive apprentices to stay in their house; and yet from them succeeding society is to be formed, and future magistrates and counsellors chosen: if they attend their hours of business, masters take no farther charge. The rest of their time may be passed (as it too often is) in vice and debauchery; hence they become idle, insolent, and dishonest. Masters complain of their servants and apprentices, but the evil often lies with themselves.

In 1763—If a young man had been led astray by bad company, he was ashamed of it, and most carefully concealed it. A young man could not have been seen in the Playhouse with bad women, without being reckoned a *Blackguard*, and exposed to contempt and ridicule.

In 1783—Youth early commence what are called *puppies*, and boast of their experience in vice before they leave school. Young men are not ashamed to sit in side-boxes with women of the town, and afterwards go into the boxes with young ladies of character, and women of fashion; and this is not, in general, treated (as it should be) as an insult, but often meets with no check, either from the mother or the daughter.

In 1763—There were about six or seven brothels or houses of bad fame in Edinburgh, and a very few only of the lowest and most ignorant order of

females skulked about at night. A person might have walked from the Castle-hill to the Abbey, without being accosted by a single prostitute.

In 1783—The number of brothels and houses of civil accommodation are increased to some hundreds; and the *women of the town* are more than in an equal proportion. Every quarter of the city and suburbs is infested with multitudes of females, abandoned to vice, and many of them before passion could mislead, or reason teach them right from wrong. Some mothers live by the prostitution of their daughters. Gentlemen's, and citizens' daughters are upon the town, who, by their dress and bold deportment, in the face of day, seem to tell us that the term Wh—e ceases to be a reproach.

In 1763—The Canongate was the foulest quarter of the city, with respect to abandoned women and brothels.

In 1783—The Canongate, by the vigilance of the magistrates of that district, is the cleanest and most quiet.

In 1763—People sent their daughters to Edinburgh, to be accomplished in their education, and to give them urbanity of manners. An Edinburgh education was thought the most likely to procure them a good marriage.

In 1783—Many people prefer a country education for their daughters; and men of sense and worth prefer a young woman bred in the country, of innocent and simple manners, with virtuous principles, to one with tinsel accomplishments, and probably a giddy and corrupted mind.

In 1763—In the best families in town, the education of daughters was fitted, not only to embellish and improve their minds, but to accomplish them in the useful and necessary arts of domestic economy. The sewing-school, the pastry-school, were then essential branches of female education; nor was a young lady of the best family ashamed to go to market with her mother.

In 1783—The daughters even of tradesmen consume the mornings at the toilet, (to which *rouge* is now an appendage), or in strolling from the perfumer's to the milliner's, &c. They would blush to be seen in a market. The cares of the family are devolved upon a housekeeper; and Miss employs those heavy hours, when she is disengaged from public or private amusements, in improving her mind from the *precious stores* of a circulating library.

It may now be said, that the generality of young men are bold in vice, and that too many of the young women imitate the meretricious airs and flippancy of courtezans.

In 1763—There was no such diversion as cock-fighting in Edinburgh.

In 1783—There have been many cock-fighting matches, or *mains*, as they are technically termed; and a regular cockpit is built for the accommodation of this school of gambling and cruelty, where every distinction of rank and character is levelled.

In 1763—The question respecting the morality of stage-plays was much agitated. A clergyman, a few years before, had been brought before the General Assembly of the Church, and suspended from his office, for having written a tragedy, perhaps one of the most chaste and interesting in the English language\*. By those who attended the theatre, even without scruple, Saturday night was thought the most improper in the week for going to the play. Any clergyman, who had been known to have gone to the play-house, would have incurred church-censure.

In 1783—The morality of stage-plays, or their effects on society, are not thought of. The most crowded houses are always on Saturday night. The boxes for the Saturday-night's play are generally bespoken for the season,

\* The Tragedy of Douglas, by Mr. Home, then a Clergyman.

so that strangers often on that night cannot get a place. This method of taking a box for the Saturday-night through the season, was lately much practised by boarding-mistresses, so that there can be no choice of the play, but the young ladies must take the dish that is set before them. The trash that by this means is often presented, (for it is always the worst play of the week), cannot fail to overcome delicacy, with respect to theatrical exhibitions. Impudent buffoons take liberties in their acting that would not have been suffered formerly.

In 1763—Young ladies might have walked through the streets in perfect security at all hours. No person would have presumed to have interrupted or spoken to them.

In 1783—The mistresses of boarding-schools find it necessary to advertise, that their young ladies are not permitted to go abroad without proper attendants. The same precaution is also necessary at dancing-schools.

In 1763—A young man was termed a *fine fellow*, who, to a well-informed and an accomplished mind, added elegance of manners, and a conduct guided by principle; one who would not have injured the rights of the meanest individual; who contracted no debts that he could not pay, and thought every breach of morality unbecoming the character of a gentleman.

In 1783—The term *fine fellow* is applied to one who can drink three bottles; who discharges all debts of honour, (or game debts and tavern bills) and evades payment of every other; who swears immoderately, and before ladies, and talks of his word of honour; who ridicules religion and morality as folly and hypocrisy, but without argument; who is very jolly at the table of his friend, and will lose no opportunity of seducing his wife, if she is handsome, or of debauching his daughter; but, on the mention of such a thing being attempted to his own connections, swears he would cut the throat, or blow out the brains of his dearest companion, who would offer such an insult. Sensible mothers should be careful what kind of *fine fellows* are admitted to visit in their families.

In 1763—Mr. Whitefield, and other pious divines from England, used occasionally to visit Edinburgh, and they were much attended by all ranks, who listened to the doctrines of Christianity and morality.

In 1783—An itinerant quack doctor publicly disseminates obscenity and blasphemy, insults magistracy, and sets the laws, decency, and common sense, at defiance.

In no respect is the decency, sobriety, and decorum of the lower ranks in 1763 more remarkable, than by contrasting them with the riot and licentiousness of 1783, particularly on Sundays and holidays. The King's birthday, and the last night of the year, seem now to be devoted to drunkenness, outrage, and riot, instead of loyalty, peace, and harmony.

In 1763, and many years preceding and following, the execution of criminals was rare; three annually were reckoned the average for the whole kingdom of Scotland. There were four succeeding years in which there was not an execution in the whole kingdom.

In 1783—There were six criminals under sentence of death in Edinburgh in one week, and, upon the Autumn Circuit, no less than thirty-seven Capital Indictments were issued."

I have only to add further, that Mr. Arnot is the best possible witness, being himself a great admirer of Moderatism, and taking every opportunity of expressing his hatred of the "fanatics," as he terms the remnants of the Evangelical Clergy that had survived till histime.

I am, dear Sir, very truly yours,

EDINENSIS.

## V.—THE DUKE OF SUTHERLAND.

[*We had hoped by this time to have received the concluding papers of this very interesting series—but have been disappointed. In the meanwhile we give what we have, and hope to gratify our readers by the continuation or rather conclusion, when it arrives*].

## IV.

There appeared at Paris, about five years ago, a singularly ingenious work on political economy, from the pen of M. de Sismondi, a writer of European reputation. The greater part of the first volume is taken up with discussions on territorial wealth, and the condition of the cultivators of the soil; and in this portion of the work there is a prominent place assigned to a subject which perhaps few of our readers would expect to find introduced through the medium of a foreign tongue to the people of a great Continental State. We find this philosophic writer, whose works are known far beyond the limits of his language, devoting an entire essay to the case of the late Duchess of Sutherland and her tenants, and forming a judgment on it very unlike that of such of the economists of our own country as have not hesitated to characterise all too prematurely her great and singularly harsh experiment, whose worst effects we are but beginning to see, as at once justifiable in itself and happy in its results. It is sufficiently curious to observe how deeds done as if in darkness and a corner, are beginning, after the lapse of nearly thirty years, to be proclaimed on the house-tops. The experiment of the late Duchess was not intended to be made in the eye of Europe; its details would ill bear the exposure. When Cobbett simply referred to it only ten years ago, the noble proprietrix was startled, as if a rather delicate family secret was on the eve of being divulged; and yet nothing seems more evident now than that civilized man all over the world is to be made aware of how the experiment was accomplished, and what it is ultimately to produce. It must be obvious, further, that the infatuation of the present proprietor, in virtually setting aside the Toleration Act on his property, must have the effect of spreading the knowledge of it all the more widely, and of rendering its results much more disastrous than they could have possibly been of themselves.

In a time of quiet and good order, when law, whether in the right or the wrong, is all potent in enforcing its findings, the argument which the philosophic Frenchman employs in behalf of the ejected tenantry of Sutherland, is an argument at which proprietors like the present Duke may afford to smile. In a time of revolution, however, when lands change their owners, and old families give place to new ones, it might be found somewhat formidable,—sufficiently so, at least, to lead a wise proprietor in an unsettled age rather to conciliate than oppress and irritate the class who might in such circumstances urge it with most effect. It is not easy doing justice in a few sentences to the facts and reasonings of an elaborate essay; but the line of argument runs somewhat thus: Under the old Celtic tenures,—the only tenures, be it remembered, through which the Lords of Sutherland derive their rights to their lands,—the *Klaan*, or children of the soil, were the proprietors of the soil;—"the whole of Sutherland," says Sismondi, belonged to "the men of Sutherland." Their chief was their monarch, and a very absolute monarch he was. "He gave the different *tacks* of land to his officers, or took them away from them, according as they showed themselves more or less useful in war; but though he could thus, in a military sense,

reward or punish the clan, he could not diminish in the least the property of the clan itself ;"—he was a chief, not a proprietor, and had "no more right to expel from their homes the inhabitants of his county, than a king to expel from his country the inhabitants of his kingdom." "Now, the Gaelic tenant," continues the Frenchman, "has never been conquered, nor did he forfeit, on any after occasion, the rights which he originally possessed ;"—in point of right, he is still a co-proprietor with his captain. To a Scotchman acquainted with the law of property as it has existed among us, in even the Highlands, for the last century, and every where else for at least two centuries more, the view may seem extreme ; not so, however, to a native of the Continent, in many parts of which, prescription and custom are found ranged, not on the side of the chief but on that of the vassal. "Switzerland," says Sismondi, "which, in so many respects, resembles Scotland in its lakes and mountains,—its climate,—the character, manners, and habits of its children,—was likewise at the same period parcelled out among a small number of Lords. If the Counts of Kyburg, of Lentzburg, of Hapsburg, and of Grugones, had been protected by the English laws, they would find themselves at the present day precisely in the condition in which the Earls of Sutherland were twenty years ago. Some of them would perhaps have had the same taste for *improvements*, and several republics would have been expelled from the Alps, to make room for flocks of sheep." "But while the law has given to the Swiss peasant the guarantee of perpetuity, it is to the Scottish laird that it has given that same guarantee in the British empire, leaving the peasant in a precarious situation." "The clan, recognised at first by the captain, whom they followed in war and obeyed for their common advantage, as his friends and relations, then as his soldiers, then as his vassals, then as his farmers,—he has come finally to regard as hired labourers, whom he may perchance allow to remain on the soil of their common country for his own advantage, but whom he has the power to expel as soon as he no longer finds it for his interest to keep them."

Arguments like those of Sismondi, however much their force may be felt on the Continent, could be formidable at home, as we have said, in only a time of revolution, when the very foundations of society would be unfixed, and opinion set loose to pull down or re-construct at pleasure. But it is surely not uninteresting to mark how, in the course of events, that very law of England which, in the view of the Frenchman, has done the Highland peasant so much less, and the Highland chief so much more than justice, is bidding fair, in the case of Sutherland at least, to carry its rude, equalizing remedy along with it. Between the years 1811 and 1820 fifteen thousand inhabitants of this northern district were ejected from their snug inland farms, by means for which we would in vain seek a precedent, except, perchance, in the history of the Irish massacre. But though the interior of the county was thus *improved* into a desert, in which there are many thousands of sheep, but few human habitations, let it not be supposed by the reader that its general population was in any degree lessened. So little was this the case, that the census of 1821 showed an increase over the census of 1811 of more than two hundred ; and the present population of Sutherland exceeds, by a thousand, its population before the change. The county has not been depopulated,—its population has been merely arranged after a new fashion. The late Duchess found it spread equally over the interior and the sea-coast, and in very comfortable circumstances,—she left it compressed into a wretched selva of poverty and suffering, that fringes the county on its eastern and western shores. And the law which enabled her to make such an arrangement, maugre the ancient rights of the poor Highlander, is now on the eve of stepping in, in its own clumsy way, to make her family pay the penalty. The evil of a Poor-law can be no longer averted from



Scotland. However much we may dislike compulsory assessment for the support of our poor, it can be no longer avoided. Our aristocracy have been working hard for it during the whole of the present century, and a little longer; the disruption of the Scottish Church, as the last in a series of events, all of which have tended towards it, has rendered it inevitable. Let the evidence of the present commissioners on the subject be what it may, it cannot be of a kind suited to show that if England should have a poor-law, Scotland should have none. The southern kingdom must and will give us a poor-law; and then shall the selvage of deep poverty which fringes the sea-coasts of Sutherland avenge on the titled proprietor of the county both his mother's error and his own. If our British laws, unlike those of Switzerland, failed miserably in her day in protecting the vassal, it will more than fail in those of her successor, in protecting the lord. Our political economists will have an opportunity of reducing their arguments regarding the improvements in Sutherland into a few arithmetical terms, which the merest tyro will be able to grapple with.

We find a similar case thus strongly stated by Cobbett in his Northern Tour, and in connection with a well-known name:—"Sir James Graham has his estate lying off this road to the left. He has not been *clearing* his estate,—the poor-law would not let him do that; but he has been clearing off the small farms, and making them into large ones, which he had a right to do, because it is he himself that is finally to endure the consequences of that: he has a right to do that; and those who are made indigent in consequence of his so doing, have a right to demand a maintenance out of the land, according to act of the 43d of Elizabeth, which gave the people a COMPENSATION for the loss of the tythes and Church lands which had been taken away by the aristocracy in reigns of the Tudors. If Sir James Graham choose to mould his fine and large estate into immense farms, and to break up numerous happy families in the middle rank of life, and to expose them all to the necessity of coming and demanding sustenance from his estate; if he choose to be surrounded by masses of persons in this state, he shall not call them *poupers*, for that insolent term is not to be found in the compensation laws of Elizabeth; if he choose to be surrounded by swarms of beings of this description, with feelings in their bosoms towards him such as I need not describe,—if he choose this, his RIGHT certainly extends thus far; but I tell him that he has no right to say to any man born in his parishes,—'You shall not be here, and you shall not have a maintenance off the lands.'"

There is but poor comfort, however, to know, when one sees a country ruined, that the perpetrators of the mischief have not ruined it to their own advantage. We shall take an early opportunity of showing how signal in the case of Sutherland this ruin has been, and how very extreme the infatuation which continues to possess its hereditary lord. We are old enough to remember the county in its original state, when it was at once the happiest and one of the most exemplary districts in Scotland, and passed at two several periods a considerable time among its hills; we are not unacquainted with it now, nor with its melancholy and dejected people, that wear out life in their comfortless cottages on the sea-shore. The problem solved in this remote district of the kingdom is not at all unworthy of the attention which it seems but beginning to draw, but which is already not restricted to one kingdom, or even one continent.

We may remark, in conclusion, that the present virtual suspension of the Toleration Act in Sutherland may not be wholly without its interest to holders of property in other parts of Scotland, especially in the law country, however little interest they may take in the cause of religious liberty generally, or the welfare of the Free Church in particular. For the sake of its

neighbours, the county must not be permitted to be made too hot for the county's population. It might be an excellent thing for the lord of Sutherland to get rid of his surplus cottagers at a time like the present, when they are on the eve of being converted into life-renters on his estate,—a second clearing, carried on under the colour of hostility to a dis-established Church, might prove more palpably beneficial to his property than the first; but Scottish proprietors elsewhere would do well to remember that they have an interest in the matter now, which they had not formerly,—at least, that they are to have an interest in it very soon.

---

## V.

Let us follow, for a little, the poor Highlanders of Sutherland to the sea coast. It would be easy dwelling on the terrors of their expulsion, and multiplying facts of horror; but had there been no permanent deterioration effected in their condition, these, all barrowing and repulsive as they were, would have mattered less. Sutherland would have soon recovered the burning up of a few hundred hamlets, or the loss of a few bed-ridden old people, who would have died as certainly under cover, though perhaps a few months later, as when exposed to the elements in the open air. Nay, had it lost a thousand of its best men in the way in which it lost so many at the storming of New Orleans, the blank ere now would have been completely filled up. The calamities of fire, or of decimation even, however distressing in themselves, never yet ruined a country: no calamity ruins a country that leaves the surviving inhabitants to develope, in their old circumstances, their old character and resources.

In one of the eastern eclogues of Collins, where two shepherds are described as flying for their lives before the troops of a ruthless invader, we see with how much of the terrible imagination of a poet could invest the evils of war, when aggravated by pitiless barbarity. Fertile as that imagination was, however, there might be found new circumstances to heighten the horrors of the scene,—circumstances beyond the reach of invention, in the retreat of the Sutherland Highlanders from the smoking ruins of their cottages to their allotments on the coast. We have heard of one man, named M'Kay, whose family, at the time of the greater conflagration referred to in our last, were all lying ill of fever, who had to carry two of his sick children on his back a distance of twenty-five miles. We have heard of the famished people blackening the shores, like the crew of some vessel wrecked on an inhospitable coast, that they might sustain life by the shell-fish and sea weed laid bare by the ebb. Many of their allotments, especially on the western coast, were barren in the extreme,—unsheltered by bush or tree, and exposed to the sweeping sea winds, and in time of tempest to the blighting spray; and it was found a matter of the extremest difficulty to keep the few cattle which they had retained, from wandering, especially in the night-time, into the better sheltered and more fertile interior. The poor animals were intelligent enough to read a practical comment on the nature of the change effected; and, from the harshness of the shepherds to whom the care of the interior had been intrusted, they served materially to add to the distress of their masters. They were getting continually impounded; and vexatious fines, in the form of trespass money, came thus to be wrung from the already impoverished Highlanders. Many who had no money to give were obliged to relieve them, by depositing some of their few portable articles of value, such as bed and body clothes, or, more distressing still, watches, and rings, and pins,—the only relics, in not a few instances, of brave men whose bones were mouldering under the fatal rampart at New Orleans, or in the arid sands of Egypt,—in that spot of proud recollection,

where the invincibles of Napoleon went down before the Highland bayonet. Their first efforts as fishermen were what might be expected from a rural people unaccustomed to the sea. The shores of Sutherland for immense tracts together, are iron-bound, and much exposed,—open on the eastern coast to the waves of the German Ocean, and on the north and west to the long roll of the Atlantic. There could not be more perilous seas for the unpractised boatman to take his first lessons on; but though the casualties were numerous, and the loss of life great, many of the younger Highlanders became expert fishermen. The experiment was harsh in the extreme, but so far, at least, it succeeded. It lies open, however, to other objections than those which have been urged against it on the score of its inhumanity.

All our readers must be acquainted with Goldsmith's remarks on the herring fishery of his days. "A few years ago," he says, "the herring fishing employed all Grub Street; it was the topic in every coffee house, and the burden of every ballad. We were to drag up oceans of gold from the bottom of the sea; we were to supply all Europe with herrings upon our own terms. At present, however, we hear no more of all this; we have fished up very little gold that I can learn; nor do we furnish the world with herrings, as was expected." We have, in this brief passage, a history of all the more sanguine expectations which have been founded on herring fisheries. There is no branch of industry so calculated to awaken the hopes of the speculator, or so suited to disappoint them. So entirely is this the case, that were we desirous to reduce an industrious people to the lowest stage of wretchedness compatible with industry, we would remove them to some barren district, and there throw them on the resources of this fishery exclusively. The employments of the herring fisher have all the uncertainty of the ventures of the gambler. He has first to lay down, if we may so speak, a considerable stake, for his drift of nets and his boat involve a very considerable outlay of capital; and if successful, and if the fishery in general be *not* successful, the *take* of a single week may more than remunerate him. A single cast of his nets may bring him in thirty guineas and more. The die turns up in his favour, and he sweeps the board. And hence those golden dreams of the speculator, so happily described by Goldsmith. But year after year may pass, and the run of luck be against the fisherman. A fishing generally good at all the stations gluts the market, necessarily limited in its demands to an average supply, and, from the bulk and weight of the commodity, not easily extended to distant parts; and the herring merchant first, and the fisherman next, find that they have been labouring hard to little purpose. Again, a fishing under average, from the eccentric character of the fish, is found almost always to benefit a few, and to ruin a great many. The average deficiency is never equally spread over the fishermen; one sweeps the boards,—another loses all. Nor are the cases few in which the accustomed shoal wholly deserts a tract of coast for years together; and thus the lottery, precarious at all times, becomes a lottery in which there are only blanks to be drawn. The wealthy speculator might perhaps watch such changes, and by supplementing the deficiency of one year by the abundance of another, give to the whole a character of average; but, alas for the poor labouring man placed in such circumstances! The yearly disbursements of our Scottish Fishery Board, in the way of assistance to poverty-stricken fishermen, unable even to repair their boats, testify all too tangibly that they cannot regulate their long runs of ill luck by their temporary successes! And if such be the case among our hereditary fishermen of the north, who derive more than half their sustenance from the white fishery, how much more must it affect those fishermen of Sutherland, who, having no market for their white fish in the depopulated interior, and no merchants settled among them to find markets farther away, have to depend exclusively

on their herring fishing. The experiment which precipitated the population of the country on its barer skirts, as some diseases precipitate the humours on the extremities, would have been emphatically a disastrous one, so far at least as the people were concerned, even did it involve no large amount of human suffering, and no deterioration of character.

One of the first writers, of unquestioned respectability, who acquainted the public with the true character of the revolution which had been effected in Sutherland, was the late General Stewart of Garth. He was, we believe, the first man,—and the fact says something for his shrewdness,—who saw a coming poor-law looming through the *clearing* of Sutherland. His statements are exceedingly valuable,—his inferences almost always just. The General, a man of probity and nice honour, had such an ability of estimating the value of moral excellence in a people, as the originators of the revolution had of estimating the respective merits of pounds of mutton and beef. He had seen printed representations on the subject,—tissues of hollow falsehood, that have since been repeated in newspapers and reviews; and though unacquainted with the facts at the time, he saw sufficient reason to question their general correctness, from the circumstance that he found in them the character of the people, with which no man could be better acquainted, vilified and traduced. The General saw one leviathan falsehood running through the whole, and, on the strength of the old adage, naturally suspected the company in which he found it. And so, making minute and faithful inquiry, he published the results at which he arrived. He refers to the mode of ejection by the torch. He next goes on to show how some of the ejected tenants were allowed small allotments of moor on the coast side, of from half an acre to two acres in extent, which it was their task to break into corn land; and how that, because many patches of green appear in this way, where all was russet before, the change has been much eulogised as improvement. We find him remarking further, with considerable point and shrewdness, that, “many persons are, however, inclined to doubt the advantages of improvements which call for such frequent apologies,” and that “if the advantage to the people were so evident, or if more lenient measures had been pursued, vindication could not have been necessary.” The General knew how to pass from the green spots themselves, to the condition of those who tilled them. The following passage must strike all acquainted with the Highlanders of Sutherlandshire as a true representation of the circumstances to which they have been reduced:—

“Ancient respectable tenants who have passed the greater part of life in the enjoyment of abundance, and in the exercise of hospitality and charity, possessing stock of ten, twenty, and thirty breeding cows, with the usual proportion of other stock, are now pining on one or two acres of bad land, with one or two starved cows, and for this accommodation a calculation is made, that they must support their families, and pay the rent of their lots, not from the produce, but from the sea; thus drawing a rent which the land cannot afford! When the herring fishing succeeds, they generally satisfy the landlord, whatever privations they may suffer; but when the fishing fails, they fall into arrears. The herring fishing, always precarious, has for a succession of years been very defective, and this class of people are reduced to extreme misery. At first, some of them possessed capital, from converting their farm stock into cash, but this has been long exhausted; and it is truly distressing to view their general poverty, aggravated by their having once enjoyed abundance and independence.”

Some of the removals to which we have referred took place during that group of scarce seasons in which the year 1816 was so prominent; but the scarcity which these induced served merely to render the other sufferings of the people more intense, and was lost sight of in the general extent of the

calamity. Another group of hard seasons came on,—one of those groups which seem of such certain, and yet of such irregular occurrence, that though they have attracted notice in our climate from the days of Bacon downwards, they have hitherto resisted all attempts to include them in some definite cycle. The summer and harvest of 1835 were the last of a series of fine summers and abundant harvest; and for six years after there was less than the usual heat, and more than the usual rain. Science, in connection with agriculture, has done much for us in the low country; and so our humbler population were saved from the horrors of a dearth of food; but on the green patches which girdle the shores of Sutherland, and which have been esteemed such wonderful improvements, science had done, and could do nothing. The people had been sinking lower and lower during the previous twenty years, and what would have been great hardship before had become famine now. We feel at times that it is an advantage to have lived among the humbler people. We have been enabled, in consequence, to detect many such gross mis-statements as those with which apologists of the disastrous revolution effected in Sutherland have attempted to gloss over the ruin of that country. In other parts of the Highlands, especially in the Hebrides, the failure of the kelp trade did much to impoverish the inhabitants; but in the Highlands of Sutherland the famine was an effect of *improvement* alone.

We saw how a late, untoward year operates on the bleak shores of the north-western Highlands, when spending a season there a good many years ago. We found what only a few twelvemonths previous had been a piece of dark moor, laid out into minute patches of corn, and bearing a dense population. The herring fishing had failed for the two seasons before, and the poor cottars were, in consequence, in arrears with their rent; but the crops had been tolerable; and though their stores of meal and potatoes were all exhausted at the time of our coming among them (the month of June), and though no part of the growing crop was yet fit for use, the white fishing was abundant, and a training of hardship had enabled them to subsist on fish exclusively. Their corn shot in the genial sun-shine, and gave fair promise; and their potatoes had become far enough advanced to supplement their all too meagre meals, when, after a terrible thunder storm, the fine weather broke up, and for thirteen weeks together there scarce passed a day without its baffling winds and its heavy chilling showers. The oats withered without ripening,—the hardy bear might be seen rustling on all the more exposed slopes, light as the common rye-grass of our hay fields,—the stalks, in vast proportion, shorn of the ears. It was only in a very few of the more sheltered places that it yielded a scanty return of a dark-coloured and shrivelled grain. And to impart a still deeper shade of gloom to the prospects of the poor Highlanders, the herring fishery failed as signally as in the previous years. There awaited them all too obviously a whole half year of inevitable famine, unless Lowland charity interfered in their behalf. And the recurrence of this state of things no amount of providence or exertion on their own part, when placed in such circumstances, can obviate or prevent. It was a conviction of this character, based on experience, which led the writer of these remarks to state, when giving evidence before the present Poor Law Commissioners for Scotland, that though opposed to the principle of legal assessment generally, he could yet see no other mode of reaching the destitution of the Highlands. Our humane Scottish law compels the man who sends another man to prison to support him there,—just because it is held impossible that within the walls of a prison a man can support himself. Should the principle alter, if, instead of sending him to a prison, he banishes him to a bleak, inhospitable coast, where, unless he receives occasional support from others, he must inevitably perish?

The sufferings of the people of Sutherland during the first of these years of destitution (1836), we find strikingly described by M'Leod :—

"In this year," says the author, "the crops all over Britain were deficient, having bad weather for growing, and ripening, and still worse for gathering in. But in the Highlands they were an entire failure, and on the untoward spots, occupied by the Sutherland small tenants, there was literally nothing fit for human subsistence. And to add to the calamity, the weather had prevented them from securing the peats, their only fuel, so that to their previous state of exhaustion, cold and hunger were to be superadded. The sufferings endured by the poor Highlanders in the succeeding winter truly beggars description. Even the herring-fishing had failed, and consequently their credit in Caithness, which depended on its success, was at an end. Any little provision they might be able to procure was of the most inferior and unwholesome description. It was no uncommon thing to see people searching among the snow for the frosted potatoes to eat, in order to preserve life. As the harvest had been disastrous, so the winter was uncommonly boisterous and severe, and consequently little could be obtained from the sea to mitigate the calamity. The distress rose to such a height as to cause a sensation all over the island, and there rose a general cry for Government interference, to save the people from death by famine."

Public meetings were held, private subscriptions entered into, large funds collected, the British people responded to the cry of their suffering fellow-subjects, and relief was extended to every portion of the Highlands except one. Alas for poor Sutherland! There, it was said, the charity of the country was not required, as the noble and wealthy proprietors had themselves resolved to interfere; and as this statement was circulated extensively through the public prints, and sedulously repeated at all public meetings, the mind of the community was set quite at rest on the matter. And interfere the proprietors at length did. Late in the spring of 1837, after sufferings the most incredible had been endured, and disease and death had been among the wretched people, they received a scanty supply of meal and seed corn, for which, though vaunted at the time as a piece of munificent charity, the greater part of them had afterwards to pay.

In our next we shall endeavour to bring these facts to bear on the cause of the Free Church in Sutherland; but we conclude for the present by just adding one curious fact more. We have already shown how the bleak moors of Sutherland have been mightily improved by the revolution which ruined its people. They bear many green patches which were brown before. Now, it so happened that, rather more than ten years ago, the idea struck the original improvers, that as green was an improvement on brown, so far as the moors were concerned, white would be an equally decided improvement on black, so far as the houses were concerned. An order was accordingly issued, in the name of the Duke and Duchess of Sutherland, that all the small tenants on both sides the public road, where it stretches on the northern coast from the confines of Reay to the Kyle of Tongue, a distance of about thirty miles, should straightwith build themselves new houses of stone and mortar, according to a prescribed plan and specification. Pharaoh's famous order could not have bred greater consternation. But the only alternative given was summed up in the magic word *removal*; and the poor Highlanders, dejected, tamed, broken in spirit as in means, well knew from experience what the magic word meant. And so, as their prototypes set themselves to gather stubble for their bricks, the poor Highlanders began to build. We again quote from M'Leod :—

"Previous to this, in the year 1829, I and my family had been forced away like others, being particularly obnoxious to those in authority for sometimes showing an inclination to oppose their tyranny, and therefore we

had to be made examples of to frighten the rest ; but in 1833 I made a tour of the district, when the building was going on, and shall endeavour to describe a small part of what met my eye on that occasion. In one locality (and this was a fair specimen of all the rest) I saw fourteen different squads of masons at work, with the natives attending them. Old gray-headed men, worn down by previous hardship and present want, were to be seen carrying stones, and wheeling them and other materials on barrows, or conveying them on their backs to the buildings, and with their tottering limbs and trembling hands straining to raise them on the walls. The young men also, after toiling all night at sea, endeavouring for subsistence, were obliged to yield their exhausted frames to the labours of the day. Even female labour could not be dispensed with ; the strong as well as the weak, the delicate and sickly, and (shame to their oppressors), even the pregnant, bare-footed, and scantily clothed, were obliged to join in those rugged, unfeminine labours. In one instance I saw the husband quarrying stones, and the wife and children dragging them along in an old cart to the building. Such were the building scenes of that period. The poor people had often to give the last morsel of food they possessed to feed the masons, and subsist on shell-fish themselves. This went on for several years, in the course of which, many hundreds of these houses were erected on unhospitable spots unfit for a human residence."

But we have more than exhausted our space, and shall conclude therefore, for the present, with one extract more.

"It might be thought," adds M'Leod, "that the design of forcing the people to build such houses was to provide for their comfort and accommodation, but there seems to have been a quite different object, which, I believe, was the true motive, and that was to hide the misery that prevailed. There had been a great sensation created in the public mind by the cruelties exercised in these districts ; and it was thought that a number of neat white houses, ranged on each side of the road, would take the eye of strangers and visitors, and give a practical contradiction to the rumours afloat ; hence the poor creatures were forced to resort to such means, and to endure such hardships and privations as I have described, to carry the scheme into effect. And after they had spent their remaining all, and more than their all, on the erection of these houses, and involved themselves in debt, for which they have been harassed and pursued ever since, what are these erections but whitened tombs ; many of them now ten years in existence, and still without proper doors or windows, destitute of furniture and of comfort, the unhappy lairs of a heart-broken, squalid, fast-degenerating race."—*Witness.*

## VI.—THE INDIA JURIST AND THE FREE CHURCH.

We had occasion to mention in our two last numbers, the publication of Mr. Wylie's pamphlet on the Scotch Law of Patronage, and his proof of the injustice and error of the decision in the first Auchterarder Case. We have since had an opportunity of reading a review of Mr. Wylie's pamphlet in the only legal periodical of Calcutta—the *India Jurist* ; and we have risen from that perusal with a deepened conviction of the distinct legality of the Veto Act, and as well as with a confirmed impression, that the decision in the House of Lords which

was the main origin of the Recent Secession, was one which will go down to posterity, as wholly indefensible.

Before we enter on the subject of the view taken by the Jurist of this question, let us first notice the weight of authority, against these encroachments of the Civil Courts on the spiritual function of ordination. The opinions of Lords Kaimes, Monboddo, and Prestongrange, and of Lord President Dundas, are well known ; the opinions of the judges who were contemporaries of these able men, has also been proved by their concurrence in their proceedings. Coming then down to our own days, what have we ? The following array :

<i>For the Veto.</i>	<i>Against it.</i>
Lord Glenlee.	Lord President Hope.
„ Moncrieff.	„ President Boylston.
„ Jeffrey.	„ Corehouse.
„ Cockburn.	„ Medwyn.
„ Fullerton.	„ Meadowbank.
„ Ivory.	„ Gillies.
	„ Cunynghame.
	„ Mackenzie.

Of these two different sets of judges, it is not too much to say, that no one would dispute in any case in which he was disinterested, that the former was by far the most eminent, by far the most enlightened, by far the most respected.

As regards Scotch Lawyers then, there can then be no question as to the side which has the weight of authority and of great names. As to English lawyers, we protest against their offhand declarations being taken as decisive testimonies of their opinions. The whole Scottish Ecclesiastical polity is entirely new to them, and they are not competent to form an unassisted judgment respecting it. Nothing rendered this so plain, as Lord Denman's proposal to the House of Lords, that they should request the Scotch judges to appear and state their opinions, as to the law laid down in Lord Aberdeen's Bill. But on the other hand, when they do study the question fairly, we have good reason to believe that they will arrive at the same conclusions as obtained in Scotland in the best days of its Courts, and as obtain now among all the judges in Scotland, who have not been, as it were, parties to the cause, by having identified themselves with the Moderate party. Is it not we may ask, a little remarkable, that two English lawyers here in Calcutta, Mr. Wylie and the Editor of the *Jurist*, studying the question far away from the scene of excitement, should both arrive at the conclusion, that the Church, and not the Civil Court, had the best of the legal argument ? As to Mr. Wylie, we know, that though he was friendly to the scriptural principles of the Free Church, his impression as to the law, was against the view of the Seceders, but he was induced to study the question, and his pamphlet shows that he has been convinced that he was in error. Both he and the Editor of the *Jurist* have, it seems, been struck, in the course of their examination of the question, with the partizan character of Lord Brougham's



judgment, and the echoing tone of Lord Cottenham's, and this, we suspect, will be the way in which posterity will be struck too. And "they that are wise," will observe in such mighty results following such infatuated decisions, the hand of the Lord, who alone can give judges wisdom, and who, when he deigns to make their natural folly accomplish his own high purposes, leaves them to themselves.

We turn now to the argument in the *Jurist*. The writer thus deals with Lord Brougham's attack on the Veto Act.

"The right of Veto, we must observe, did not originate with the Veto Act, as we have shown : it is therefore a mere waste of words to argue the right as dependent upon it. This is one of Lord Brougham's most prominent fallacies ; and Lord Cottenham rests the whole case upon it : the presentee was vetoed under the Act : Lord Brougham sets about demolishing the Act : we shall presently see how he has done it, but we unhesitatingly say, that, admitting his argument, assuming the illegality of the Veto Act, the consequence should be, to send the presentee back to the parish for admission, subject to the Veto if the parishioners chose to exercise it in a legal manner, as they might under the act of 1690, and not under the Veto Act. But why is the Veto Act illegal ? For two reasons : (1) that it enabled the people to reject the minister without giving their reasons : secondly, because it vested the right of voting only in the male heads of families in the parish. Really as to the first reason, we cannot see why the people and the patron should not in this respect be on an equal footing : the law defines and ecclesiastical usage and practice establish what are sufficient reasons—(and amongst these, both by statute and church law, the "disapproval" of the people is specially noted as *sufficient*), and if the people Vote the veto, it may fairly be assumed that it is for all or some or one of these reasons ; just as it is not presumed against the patron, that he presented a person for reasons, which could not decently be avowed or mentioned. And with respect to the second argument, if the greater or less extent of the franchise, is a mere matter of ecclesiastical regulation, and the General Assembly has by statute law, jurisdiction to fix the franchise, the franchise determined upon, would not be illegal, because Lord Brougham's ingenuity could shew that it was open to objections ; and, with respect to the objections, which his Lordship does offer, they are borrowed from discussions of the electual franchise in the House of Commons, and on the hustings always emanating from the Tories, and have, over and over again, been rebutted by the friends of a representation of the people. "The act of the General Assembly," says his lordship, "specified the majority of the male heads of the families. Why the male heads ? Was there nothing to be said in reference to any other branches of families, except the male heads upon a matter of salvation ? Why, we were living under a Christian, not under a Mahomedan law. Supposing there were three or four single women, or three or four widows in a parish ; was this appointment to be considered as a matter of perfect indifference to them ? Were they to be regarded as having no interest in the question ? The General Assembly said those persons should

have just whoever the male heads chose to impose upon them. Heads of families ! But why not respectable and well-informed journey-men ? Why not a well-informed and learned scholar, being a young man, perhaps with more learning, than all the rest of the parish put together ? No, it was only the male heads of families !"—Heads or tails, or both, it is quite certain that if there was to be a Veto, it would not the less displease Lord Brougham, because it was shared with "single women," "widows," "well-informed and learned scholars," whether "young" or old men, and married women, though these Lord Brougham does not mention, as if they had no interest, to use his lordship's words, "upon a matter of salvation." Why, my lord, if these classes are as entitled to a vote as you suppose, if they are a real object of your solicitude, pray tell us, what you think they would say, if asked whether they would prefer an absolute unqualified right of patronage in an individual, a lord, or a state secretary, or the right of Veto, such as the Veto Act establishes. But Lord Brougham will take care not to ask this question ; he knows very well, that, under the pretence of advocating their right, he is promoting a purpose which they deem most injurious to them : and in answer to his exclamation "Heads of families !" we say heads of families ;—rather than what you would substitute, a *patron* ! A patron, indeed ! The souls of Christian men and women part and parcel of a benefice and the privilege of a patron ! !"

This writer does in fact show, and that clearly, the "*malus animus*" and the illogical tenor of Lord Brougham's judgment. The following is an outline of the Jurist's whole argument.

"Briefly to sum up," he says the following leading points have been established :

"(1) Patronage was abolished at the revolution. (2) The right of presentation, or nomination or right of patronage, for they are substantially the same, which had been exercised by the patron, was vested in the heritors and elders of the parish. (3) The right of presentation, or patronage, or, more strictly still, the initiative right of *nomination*, when exercised by the heritors and elders, was subject to the approval, or disapproval, or Veto of the congregation, or people. Therefore (4) as Lord Brougham has also shewn, patronage and the Veto may co-exist, and are not incompatible. (5) The abolition of patronage as a right of property, was one of those constitutional laws the inviolability of which was ensured at the Union. (6) Patronage, as a right of property, was revived by the statute of Anne. (8) The ministers presented by the patron were entitled to be admitted only as they would have been entitled, had they been presented by the heritors and elders. (9) Therefore as the persons presented by the heritors and elders were subject to a Veto, so were those presented by the patron."

These are the points which a lawyer of established reputation, of a reputation established at home as well as in this country, considers that he has *proved* ; after a consideration of the question on its mere legal merits, without interest in it, or former bias on one side or the other. "The above legal argument," he says, "presents precisely what our opinion would be were it a common question ; our honest dis-

interested unbiassed conclusions as lawyers, for we are neither Scotsmen nor Presbyterians, nor related in any way to those who are."

Perhaps to some of our readers, the severity with which the judgment of Lord Brougham, has been handled, may be surprizing. But we apprehend, that if they consider the importance of the question, its *immense* national importance, and then consider that Lord Brougham, taking advantage of his position as a member of the House of Lords, displayed the spirit of a mere party-leader, introduced party-topics into his speech, and cited Dr. Robertson, the half-hearted Christian, and the warm leader of the Moderate party, as the model of a Scotch Church-man, their astonishment at that severity will be abated. Let them mark Mr. Wylie's observations on that judgment "I must notice" says the learned gentleman "that Lord Brougham in his judgment, appears (I say it with all respect for his most eminent abilities,) to have claimed the right of defending the Moderates as one of their party. When the Veto Act of 1834, was passed, he as Lord Chancellor highly approved of it, and spoke of it, and of the noble lord, who proposed it, with the highest commendation. But in his judgment, he called on himself to remember, that he was a relative (collaterally) of Dr. Robertson; he styled him, "a wise statesman," he lauded his policy; and in a style far more fitted for his successor as leader of a party, than for a judge of the first judicial tribunal in the land, he declaimed against those, by whom the Church was released from the "moderate" ascendancy; and he has ever since pursued the subject with all his constitutional energy, as though it were a matter of personal honor and interest. It is remarkable that his own maternal grand-father, to whom he also referred, was a minister forcibly settled in his parish by a riding commission and a troop of soldiery, and that, not without a serious riot, followed, I believe by bloodshed."

Well is it to be free from the supremacy of such judges, and the operation of such judgments!

While we are on this subject of the judgment in the House of Lords, we may farther remark a peculiar circumstance connected with it. When the Non-Intrusionists refused to give up their Veto, and preferred rather to keep it at the sacrifice of their connection with the State, they were branded as rebels. Since the Secession, Lord Aberdeen's Act has declared the law to have been different to what the House of Lords said that it was; for that act, does not *alter* the law, but declares such and such things, contrary to the Decision of the House of Lords, to be law. It therefore comes to this, that "*the rebels*" were right after all. The law which they were called upon to obey, as so sacred, so paramount a thing, is rudely cast aside by those who formerly most loudly insisted on obedience to it, and it is now declared *not* to be law! Well may the judges of the House of Lords say "Save us from our *friends*!"

Here, for the present, we leave the legal part of the late controversy. The historical and legal parts of it are not easily disentangled, and together, they form a subject for most interesting investigation. In Dr. Duff's Lectures, in Mr. Wylie's pamphlet, in the Jurist, and in our own

pages, our readers have now been supplied with the means of forming a judgment on both these important matters, separately or combined. And it is well, that both should be thoroughly understood. The question is not a trifling one :—had the Seceders right on their side before they seceded, or did they secede only after having been worsted in a conflict on which they ought never to have entered? It is well, that we ourselves should be satisfied on this subject, and that we should be able to satisfy others, and at least our own children; for the controversy has not ended. Ere long, it is very certain, that the Moderates who now have the ascendancy in the Church, will cause their power to be felt. The adherents of the Residuaries may be confident, that there will soon be more forcible intrusions, and that as members of the Residuary Church, they must either be parties to such unscriptural settlements, or must “come out and be separate.” Let us then bear in mind, in order that we may be able to tell *them*, that they are sinning against law, against justice, and against their own Church’s and their country’s constitution, no less than they are forming pastoral relationships on which they can expect no blessing from the Most High. To such we would add but one word more. It is possible that you may be merely mistaken; it is possible that you may be as yet misinformed or uninformed; if so, is it not right, that you should fairly and candidly examine a question so important? But it *may be*, that you are not misinformed or uninformed; that you are under no misapprehensions, but that you are *sinning against light*. Alas! if it be so, for your own peace, for your own destiny! Your unconscientious support of your cause will not prosper; God will baffle you; you will find a blight on all you do for it, and on every bud of hope. “*Be sure your sin will find you out*.” God, the heart searching God, is NOT MOCKED, nor will He see His own righteous cause opposed, without justly avenging His own Elect.

## VII.—FRAGMENTS CONCERNING PATRONAGE.

[*The subject of Patronage as involved in Queen Anne’s faithless Act, is at present of peculiar interest;—for that Act has virtually led to the disruption, if not dissolution of the Scottish Church Establishment. We present our readers with two Extracts illustrative. (I.) Of the passing of the Act (from a Historical Tract by the Rev. Mr. Begg.)—(II.) Of the Church’s Protest, many years afterwards, against that Act, as shewn in a record of the Synod of Fife. It is a specimen of many other such Protests.*]

### 1.—THE PASSING OF THE ACT.

The other Act was, however, the main pillar of their confidence, viz., the act restoring Church patronage, and overturning, on this point, the whole Revolution Settlement.

To prove that both these acts were concocted by the Scotch Jacobites, for the basest ends, and that especially this last was designed to upset our

Church, attend to the following extracts. The first is from a letter, preserved by Wodrow in MS., and quoted by Dr. Welsh in his evidence before the House of Commons, written as early as 1708, by a distinguished member of the Jacobite faction, once a bishop, to another Scotch Episcopalian. It is rather more satisfactory than the theoretical assertions of certain prejudiced modern Churchmen. After stating that the grand object at which the party must aim was the restoration of Prelacy, and that the act of Union had made that very difficult, the author goes on to say—'The matter must first be sounded at a distance, and a just computation of our strength made, and some previous settlement made—such as *restoring of patronage and the granting of indulgence*, with liberty to possess churches and benefices; and this will undoubtedly make way for an entire re-establishment of the ancient apostolic order of bishops; for our Queen having right, as patron, to a great many churches, she will still prefer those of our persuasion to others; and the rest of laical patrons, partly through inclination and partly through interest, to please her Majesty, will follow her example.\* Lockhart of Carnwath, the wily, profound, and unscrupulous leader of the Scotch Jacobites, is no less explicit. 'As my chief, my only design,' says he 'by engaging in public affairs, was to serve the Kirk. i. e. the Pretender, 'so far as I was capable, I had that always primarily in view. \* \* \* And, in order to prepare those who I knew would not assist the King, out of a principle of loyalty (I mean the west country Presbyterians), for receiving impressions that might prevail with them on other topics, I had, in concert with Dr. Abercromby, been at a good deal of pains to publish and disperse amongst these people papers which gave them, from time to time, full accounts of what were likely to be the consequences of the union, and showed how impossible it was for the Scots to subsist under it. AND I PRESSED THE TOLERATION AND PATRONAGE ACTS MORE EARNESTLY, that I thought the Presbyterian clergy would be from thence convinced that the establishment of their Kirk would, in time, be overturned, as it was obvious that the security thereof was not so thoroughly established by the Union as they imagined.'† These being the undoubted designs of the conspirators, and they having arranged in secret all their plans, and done their best to mystify and confound the clergy of the Church of Scotland without success, Mr. Murray, one of the Scotch members, suddenly rose in the House of Commons, on the 13th of March, 1712, nine months after the glozing letter to the Assembly already quoted, and obtained leave to bring in a bill for restoring Church patronage in Scotland. The bill was accordingly brought in, and passed so rapidly through its various stages, that on the 7th of April it passed the House of Commons, 173 members voting for, and 76 against it. On the 8th of April it was brought up to the House of Lords.

The Church of Scotland took instant alarm, and was convinced her worst fears were realised, when she saw this bill first introduced. At a meeting of the Commission of the Assembly, Carstares, Blackwell, and Baillie, were sent to London with a strong remonstrance, and instructions to offer the utmost opposition to the measure. But so rapid were the movements of the enemy, that, by the time they reached London, the Bill had passed the Commons, and been taken to the House of Lords. The Lords consented to hear them by counsel on the subject; but, although their plea was as righteous as any ever submitted to a human tribunal, so determined were the enemies of the Church, that they heard the counsel for these Commissioners, read the bill a second time, committed it, reported it, and read it a

\* Patronage Report, p. 237.

† Lockhart Papers, vol. i. pp. 417, 418.

*third time, all in one day, viz. the 12th of April. On the 14th it was returned to the House of Commons with amendments, which, being agreed to without opposition, the bill received the royal assent by Queen Anne on the throne on the 22d of April, the whole transaction being completed in little more than a month.* It is of importance to notice in Hansard's History of the Debates in Parliament, that of thirteen Bishops who were *present* in the House of Lords, *five voted against the bill*: and the Commissioners for the church assert, in their representation to the House of Lords, that 'it cannot but seem strange that this bill should be so much insisted upon, when there are *so many patrons, and those, too, of the most considerable in Scotland, that are against such a restitution.*' It is also mentioned by Wodrow, in a memorial which he drew up in 1717, on the subject of patronage, 'that the King,' (George I.) 'when Elector of Hanover, *did express his dislike of the bill for bringing in patrons, as what would break his best friends in Scotland*' All opposition, however, was unavailing; for it was the determination of those in power to carry through this measure, which, as Burnet informs, was framed '*on design to weaken and undermine the Presbyterian Establishment,*' since 'it was set up by the Presbyterians from their first beginning as a principle, that parishes had, from warrants of Scripture, a right to choose their ministers.' Sir Walter Scott, also, himself a decided Jacobite, justly says—'The act which restored to patrons the right of presenting clergymen to vacant churches was designed to *render the churchmen more dependent on the aristocracy*, and to separate them, in some degree, from their congregations, who could not be supposed to be equally attached to, or influenced by, a minister who held his living by the gift of a great man, as by one who was chosen by their own free voice.' If any farther evidence were required of this, than is furnished by the whole scope of this dark history, and the unanimous testimony of historians of every diversity of opinion on other subjects, it may be found in the fact, that when Carstairs was in London on this occasion, he found several other bills prepared for harrassing and crippling the Church of Scotland; and particularly two—one A BILL FOR ABOLISHING ALL GENERAL ASSEMBLIES!!—and another for compelling Presbyteries, *under certain penalties, to settle any licentiate who received a presentation, without further form or trial*, and especially without any form of consulting the parishioners. The Ministry soon also gave other decided evidences of deadly hostility to the Church of Scotland.

Next came the Assembly of 1712; and in the true spirit of hypocrisy and brazen impudence, those who had been acting so shamefully, approach that Court, whose very existence they had deliberately threatened, with the following fawning language:—'Lest any late occurrences may have possessed some of you with fears and jealousies, we take this solemn occasion to assure you that it is *our firm purpose to maintain the Church of Scotland as established by law,*' &c. The General Assembly, of course, treated such assurances only with the respect to which, coming from such a quarter, they were entitled—condemned the patronage act as ruinous to the interests of the Church, and a deliberate violation of the Treaty of Union—and showed that they were fully as well aware of the evils likely to spring from that measure, as we are after nearly a century and a half of experience.

According to the laws and immemorial practice of the Church of Scotland, she has always required, before proceeding to ordain any individual to the holy ministry in any of her parishes, that, besides a presentation to a living by a patron, he should produce a *call* from the flock over which he is to minister in holy things: That important and solemn document is conceived in the following terms:—

'We, the heritors, elders, heads of families, and parishioners, of the parish of—, within the bounds of the Presbytery of—, and county

of——, taking into our consideration the present destitute state of the said parish, through the want of a Gospel ministry among us, occasioned by the death of our late pastor, the Rev ——; and being satisfied with the learning, abilities, and other good qualifications of you, Mr.——, preacher of the Gospel, and having heard you preach to our satisfaction and edification, do hereby invite and call you, the said Mr.——, to take the charge and oversight of this parish, and to come and labour among us in the work of the Gospel ministry, hereby promising to you all due respect and encouragement in the Lord. We likewise entreat the Reverend Presbytery of—— to approve and concur with this our most cordial call, and to use all proper means for making the same effectual, by your ordination and settlement among us, as soon as the steps necessary thereto will admit. In witness whereof, we subscribe these presents at the church of——, on this the —— day of ——, eighteen hundred and—— years.'

During the greater part of the last and the earlier part of the present century, when pure religion was at a very low ebb in the Scottish Church, as well as in the Church of England, the spiritual interests of the people, in the settlement of ministers, were entirely disregarded, and the Presbyteries of the Church reduced *the call* of the people to a meer mockery, sustaining a document in the above terms as a valid and sufficient call, although subscribed by perhaps no more than *one* individual, while the whole body of the people was united as one man against the settlement."

## 2.—PROTEST AGAINST THE ACT.

At Couper, the 2d day of April, One thousand seven hundred and thirty-five years.

The Synod of Fife taking into their serious consideration that Patronages, with power of presenting men to take the oversight of souls, is a manifest encroachment upon the rights and liberties of the Church of Christ, which the judicatories and faithful men of this Church, from its Reformation, *have always complained of and struggled against*, as what deprives Christian Congregations of that interest they ought to have in calling their own pastors, and which is claimed and asserted by the Assemblies of this Church: And further considering, that some do accept of presentations before any call from the vacant congregations, and without the advice and consent of the Presbytery of the bounds, and sometimes even before the parishioners have occasion to hear them, or show their inclinations to them; and adhere to their presentations notwithstanding the aversion of the congregations, and thereby give great offence in showing so little regard to the weighty ends of the gospel-ministry, the glory of the great and chief Shepherd, and the edification of his flock, and in affording too much occasion to people to look on them as seeking more a living to themselves than to serve the Lord Jesus Christ: Therefore, the Synod of Fife do hereby give warning to all ministers and preachers of the gospel within their bounds, of the evil and danger of such undue acceptance of presentations; earnestly exhorting and admonishing to beware thereof, as they would not mar the edification of Christ's flock, and continue this *heavy grievance* upon this Church, and expose themselves to the just censure of its judicatories. And to the intent this admonition may be more regarded, the Synod appoints a copy thereof to be recorded in all the Presbytery books within that bounds, and that the Presbyteries, at their first meeting after the minutes of the Synod come to their hands, cause read the same judicially, and also give copies thereof to

all the ministers and preachers within their bounds, and likewise to all students of divinity as may be presently under their trials, or hereafter may be taken on trials by them; and that hereafter, before they enter any upon trial, either for preaching the gospel or for the holy ministry, they endeavour to understand their sentiments anent *Presentations* being a grievance to *this Church*, and their resolution to observe the recommendation of this Act.

## VIII.—CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE.

READER! Consider what those holy men of God, whose names are here given and writings quoted, felt in regard to SIN.

I do not only betray the venom of my heart by poisoning my common actions, but even my most inward performances also with sin. I cannot pray but I sin; I cannot hear or preach a sermon but I sin; nay, I cannot so much as confess my sins, but my very confessions are still aggravations of them; my repentance needs to be repented of, my tears want washing, and the very washing of my tears needs to be washed over again—BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

I have often had very affecting views of my own vileness. I have had a vastly greater sense of my own wickedness, and the badness of my heart, since my conversion, than ever I had before. It has often appeared to me, that if God should mark iniquity against me, I should appear the very worst of all mankind, of all that have been since the beginning of the world to this time, and that I should have by far the lowest place in hell. My wickedness, as I am in myself, has long appeared to me perfectly ineffable, and infinitely swallowing up all thoughts and imagination, like an infinite deluge, or infinite mountains over my head. I know not how to express better what my sins appear to me to be, than by heaping infinite upon infinite, and multiplying infinite by infinite. I go about very often, for these many years, with such expressions in my mind and in my mouth, infinite upon infinite! infinite upon infinite! When I look into my heart and take a view of my wickedness, it looks like an abyss deeper than hell; and it appears to me, were it not for free grace, exalted and raised up to the infinite height of all the fulness and glory of the great Jehovah, and the arm of his power and grace, stretched forth in all the majesty of his power, and in all the glory of his sovereignty, I should sink down in my sins infinitely below hell itself; and yet I be not the least inclined to think that I have greater conviction than ordinary; it seems to me, my conviction of sin is exceeding small and faint. It appears to me enough to amaze me, that I have no more sense of my sin.—PRESIDENT EDWARDS.

“I have oft-times seen a law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and leading me into captivity to the law of sin and death. So powerful and mighty have been the actings of some inward corruptions, that I have not been able to overcome them, but have been hurried away captive by them. Hereby I come to see that truth, ‘the heart of man is desperately wicked, who can know it?’ I cannot fathom the depth of iniquity which is in my heart. Hereupon I am made to cry out with Paul, ‘O wretched man, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? O Lord be not far from me, make haste to help me. Let the sighing of the pri-



soner come before thee ; proclaim liberty to thy captive, and the opening of the prison doors to him that is bound with the chains of sin.'—OWEN STOCKTON.

I have much unsubdued corruption and remaining sin in my soul,—so much vanity and so many follies.—such stupid inattention and odious ingratitude,—such stubborn irresolution and unconquerable pride,—such frequent sallies of foolish desire, and workings of evil affection. I have so much unsubdued corruption as would sink me into despair and hurry me into distraction, were it not for that great, that delightful name, *The Lord our righteousness*. But thither I fly ! O that I could do it every moment ! On this I trust. O that I could do it with full assurance ! For thus I argue ; though my depravity is great,—far greater is my Saviour's merits. What can equal the merits of God's glorious, inconceivably glorious Son ? Let us never forget this our resting place at such seasons. I think it best to beware of too much disquietude. Why should we covet to be scourged with lashes of conscience, when our Divine Master was wounded for these sins, and crucified for these iniquities ? Will our uneasiness add any thing to the value of Christ's atonement ? My comfort, on such occasions, is also derived from turning such Scriptures as the following into prayer : Hos. xiv. 4. Zach. xiii. 1. Heb. ix. 13, 14. 1 John ii. 1, 2.—HERVEY.

Let us blush and be confounded for our unbelief, and may the Lord of all power and grace help our unbelief. Unbelief treats God as a liar ; because it rejects the testimony he has borne concerning his dear Son,—it dishonours his goodness,—it makes us idolize our own performances.—sacrilegiously robs the Redeemer of his honour,—and most arrogantly ascribe them to self. O that base, vile, destructive unbelief.—HERVEY.

I find that, though, in my judgment and profession, I acknowledge Christ to be my righteousness and peace ; yet, upon examination, I observe that my heart hath done quite another thing, and that secretly I have gone about to establish my own righteousness, and have derived my peace from mine own actings. For, when I have been disquieted with the actings of my sin, that which hath recovered me to my former peace hath not been that I could find God speaking peace through the blood of Christ, but rather from the intermission of temptation and the cessation of these sins. When I have been troubled at an evil frame of heart, I do not find that the righteousness of Christ hath been my consolation ; but that which has relieved me, as far as I can find, was, that afterwards I found myself in a better temper. Having been in trouble and perplexity, I have read the Scripture, gone to prayer, and, in doing these, I have been relieved. Yet I do not find that, at such times, I had a real true living communion with God in these duties, or that the Spirit of God did, in these duties, reveal to me my interest in Christ and so quiet my conscience.

Hence I come to see what great need I have, and that it is of singular use to watch over my soul in all its ways, both in reference to sin, that I fall not into it, and, when fallen, what the carriage and actions of my soul are at that time ;—whether I flee for relief to God in Christ, or to my own works : for as Satan keeps some alienated from God by the gross pollutions of the world, so he keeps others from Christ, by their establishing a righteousness of their own. O Lord ! break thou through this snare for me.—OWEN STOCKTON.

I am exceedingly grieved and ashamed for my wandering thoughts that pass through my mind. To sin against so good and gracious a God and Saviour, is matter of deep affliction to me. I could weep bitterly for the

sin of my nature. These wandering thoughts are very sinful to me upon the brink of eternity,—I am not able to keep my heart with Christ.—SHERIFF.

This good man continued for some days before his death, mourning over wandering thoughts, and said they were his chief distress, and made him desire to be no more. .

## IX.—MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*[In the absence of other more important or more satisfactory intelligence from Home, owing to the lateness of the Overland arrival, we must for the present content ourselves with the following items—some of earlier, some of later date—but all conveying some interest.]*

### 1.—FIRST LONDON CIRCULAR.

COMMITTEE ROOM, 3, Exeter Hall, July 3rd, 1843.

DEAR SIR,—You are aware of the great ecclesiastical movement which has lately occurred in Scotland, and which has occasioned the withdrawal of 500 Ministers, and a still greater number of Congregations, from the Established Church of that Country. In order to accommodate the large mass of the population adhering to the Free Church, it is essential that 600 places of worship be erected before winter, and, to aid in this great work, the present Committee has been formed. In making their appeal to your Christian liberality, the Committee chiefly rest their claim on the following considerations:—

1. The present movement promises the Evangelization of Scotland. The ministers who have left the Establishment are those who, when within its pale, did most to promote the Gospel. They include all the Ministers under whose preaching any extensive revival of religion took place. The sacrifice which they have made for Christ's Crown, has led them, more than ever, to glory in his Cross; and now, when they have carried with them the ardent attachment of their Christian people,—the unfeigned admiration of many worldly men,—and the cordial sympathy of the Evangelical denominations in Scotland,—now, when they are relieved from the irksomeness of controversy and the anxieties of fruitless negotiation, as well as from sundry restraints peculiar to their former position; they stand upon the field disencumbered and devoted men,—the HOME MISSIONARIES OF SCOTLAND; and in the hand of God, and with the help of sister Churches, this event promises to do more than any occurrence has for ages done, to retrieve the character and revive the religion of their native land.

2. The present is a Special Emergency. The Congregations are willing to undertake the sustentation of their own Pastors, and the Ministers are willing to cast themselves on the liberality of their people. But the sudden rearing of so many fabrics is an effort to which the utmost resources of Ministers and people are unequal, unless they be aided from without. Many Congregations are at present worshipping in the open air, or in sheds and barns, and ruined buildings, and similar places of precarious shelter; and unless churches be erected before the stern Northern winter sets in, such Congregations will be exposed to the severest sufferings.

3. The people of Scotland made no appeal for help, until they had done their utmost to help themselves. With the greatest alacrity they have shared the privations of their Pastors, and in many cases by the permanent abridgment of their worldly enjoyments, have sought to help forward this great work. But Scotland is not a rich Country, and the adherents of the Free Church include comparatively few of its nobles and its wealthiest men. And notwithstanding the unprecedented amount spontaneously and joyfully given, this great undertaking must be crippled in its outset, unless the Christians of other Countries arise promptly to aid their fellow-Christians in Scotland.

The Committee have been less reluctant to make this appeal as they anticipate a cheerful response; and commending the subject to your kindest consideration, and hoping to be favoured with an early reply,

We remain,

Dear Sir,

Your's Faithfully,

JAMES C. BURNS, } *Secretaries.*  
JAMES HAMILTON, }

\* \* Besides Churches, it will be requisite to build many Schools and a Hall for the Education of Theological Students. Separate Donations for these objects, as well as appropriate Books for the Theological Library, will be thankfully received.

## 2.—SECOND CIRCULAR.

### LONDON COMMITTEE.

*President.*—The most noble the Marquis of Breadalbane, &c. &c. &c.

*Chairmen of Committee.*—The Right Honourable Fox Maule, M. P.; Patrick Maxwell Stewart, Esq., M. P.; and Alexander Campbell, Esq. of Monzie, M. P.

*Treasurer.*—James Nisbet, Esq. 21, Berner's Street.

*Secretaries.*—Rev. James C. Burns, 17, Gibson Square, Islington; and Rev. James Hamilton, 7, Lansdowne Place, Burnswick Square.

COMMITTEE ROOM, No. 13, *Exeter Hall*, August, 1843.

DEAR SIR,—You are doubtless well aware, ere this time, of the Great Ecclesiastical Movement which has recently taken place in Scotland, and more or less familiar with the circumstances which have given rise to it. You cannot but have heard, (for who has not?) that the Established Church of our Father-land,—which used to be her boast,—for which other nations envied her,—and in which since the days of the Reformation, have lain her chief strength and glory,—is broken up, and in ruins,—that she has lost the services of nearly one half of her Ministers,—that the great mass of the people have forsaken her,—and that comparatively a mere handful of those who were wont to be her best friends, and bravest defenders, remain in her communion. Such, we grieve to say it, is indeed the fact; “Zion is a wilderness,—Jerusalem a desolation—our holy and beautiful house, in which our fathers worshipped, is burned up as with fire, and all our pleasant things are laid waste.” The *Establishment*, no doubt, remains,—as yet intact and secure, but having forfeited the Nation's confidence, and the Christian peo-

ple's love, it may truly be said, "the strength is gone out of her,—the glory is departed."

This result, from the Controversy, which for several years past has divided the Church, and the country, however much to be deplored, was not altogether unforeseen. The two great parties in the contest, it had become evident, could no longer "walk together," because no longer, even tacitly "agreed." In prosecuting her work of self-reformation and self-extension, the Church had been led on the one hand, to revive ancient principles,—to re-assert forgotten truths,—to resume, in short, her old, her original position, as an Independent Church of Christ, asserting His authority, and her own freedom, the ally, the auxiliary of the State, but not its "creature," nor its slave.

These principles on the other hand, the State disliked,—disowned;—the Conditions of the Establishment were declared to be, what, since the Revolution of 1688, they never were, or were never understood by either party, to be, before, viz., that it should be subject to the control of the civil power, not only in things *civil*, but in things *sacred* also,—that the officer bearers of the Church should have no authority, and its members no privilege, save what the Courts of Law might be pleased to allow them,—that the obnoxious Law of Patronage should remain unmodified and absolute,—that, in short, to use the words of the Premier Sir Robert Peel, in his place in Parliament, the great "question should be settled," not on the principles of Scottish Presbyterianism, but "of English jurisprudence."

This decision, pronounced by the Legislature last spring, (and now enacted into law, under the title of Lord Aberdeen's Bill,) rendered inevitable, the disruption, which on the 18th of May took place in Edinburgh. As the State *would* not, and the Church, without dishonour and sin, *could* not yield the point at issue, no alternative remained, but that the weaker party should retire from the contest, that the *alliance*, having become a source of discord and weakness to both, not of strength or advantage to either, should be dissolved.

This, accordingly, was in effect done, when the Moderator of the General Assembly laid his protest upon the table, at its late meeting, and, at the head of the reforming party, who had for ten years previous, constituted the majority of the Church, retired, at the same moment, without the walls of St. Andrews', and without the pale of the Establishment.

Though dis-established, however, "the Free Church of Scotland," is not destroyed. It still lives, and grows, and flourishes. Four hundred and seventy ordained ministers, and above two hundred licentiates have adhered to her, and they have been followed, by nearly a million of the population. Seven hundred and eighty congregations have been already organized. And, such is the demand for a preached Gospel, at the hands of the Free Church, that there is little doubt but, in a short time, were places of worship erected, there might be a congregation formed in every parish in Scotland.

But, for the accomplishment of this, the Funds hitherto provided, though munificent and ample, beyond all former precedent, are totally inadequate. The amount required, at the very lowest computation, for the erection of 600 places of worship, is £300,000, and this is required immediately; not more, however, than *two-thirds* of this sum has been contributed; nor, it is believed, can much more be expected, from Scotland itself, which has already done its utmost. A Committee has accordingly been formed in London, under the Presidency of the Marquis of Breadalbane, with the view of aiding this great national enterprise. And it is in the name of that Committee, that we have taken the liberty of addressing the present communication to you. It has occurred to us, that were an appeal made to our fellow-countrymen abroad,—there are many of them *who* "for their brethren and com-

panions' sakes" at home, may be found not unwilling to respond to it,—and thus, though removed from the scene, to share in the honour of the great movement. It is a movement, we think, of which any Scotchman may be proud,—proving as it does, that the spirit of our fathers, though long dormant, is not dead, that there are men among us still, whose principles have stronger hold of them, than their dearest worldly interests—that freedom is still native to the Scottish soil. It is a movement too in which we think all Christians may be expected to sympathize, of whatever country, of whatever name, as involving in it the sacred rights of conscience, the sole authority of Scripture in regulating the affairs of Christ's Church, the Supremacy of Christ as King! It is at once a Protestant and a Catholic movement. *Protestant*, as opposed to all Popish and Erastian domination over the consciences of men; and *Catholic*, as affording a common basis on which all those may unite, and act in concert, who "hold the Head," and who love the truth, the purity, and the freedom of the Gospel. It is, emphatically, Scotland's "*Third Reformation*," the fit, and appropriate sequel of the other two.

We rejoice in being able to say, that tokens of sympathy from afar, have already begun to be received by us. While Ireland has done, and England is doing its duty, America has afforded us (in the contribution of £2,200 from four individuals in New York) a gratifying pledge of what may yet be expected from her. Tidings from India have convinced us, that something substantial will be done there, among the numerous influential Scotchmen at each of the three Presidencies. And in short, we see no reason to doubt, but that the cause needs only to be known in its real magnitude and importance, to awaken universal interest. When the cry of *Destitution* in the Highlands went across the Ocean, a few years ago, thousands of pounds were, in the course of a brief period, transmitted for its relief, a sum greater than the Committee at Home knew well how to use; *shall it be*, that a similar, only a far *stronger* appeal shall now be made, and made in vain?—that when Scotland, throughout all her borders, calls aloud for help, for help in providing her poor people with "the bread and water that endure to everlasting life," for "help against the mighty," who would deprive them of the inestimable boon,—there shall be no sympathetic response from those who remember with affection the land of their fathers, who still look back with reverence to the sanctities of her peaceful Sabbaths, of her happy homes, and who, perhaps, even in the land of their sojourn, have never known such hardships, as those which are now for conscience sake endured by their brethren, whom they have left behind? We cannot allow ourselves to believe it, we are sanguine enough to expect that the rate of contribution from abroad may be found even to exceed, that which has been received at home, and we have ventured to send this our appeal to you, in the hope that you will lend us your aid in carrying its object into effect.

The following is a Tabular statement of the financial position of the Free Church according to the most recent accounts. Exclusive of the sums contributed and promised for the *Sustentation* Fund by individuals, and by 778 Associations, amounting to above £78,000 per annum—there has been reported, for the *Building Fund*, in behalf of which we now address you:—

Direct Donations .....	43,192	3	8
Produce of the First Collecting Week .....	15,217	0	0
Second   ,,   estimated at .....	20,000	0	0
778 Associations at an average of £137 16s .....	107,298	0	0
Ireland .....	10,000	0	0
England (say) .....	20,000	0	0
(Of which about one-half has been already collected)	<hr/>		
	£215,707	3	8

leaving a balance of at least £85,000, which *must* be realized, if the *existing* congregations which during the summer months have been worshipping in the open air, are to be provided with shelter against the coming winter;—not to speak of what remains to be done,—for those congregations, only as yet in process of formation, for the erection of schools and manse, for the establishment of a College, and for the support of the five Schemes, of Home and Foreign Missionary enterprise, all of which undertakings the first General Assembly of the Free Church, magnanimously resolved to prosecute, trusting alone to the support of the Christian people—to the providence and the blessing of God.

May we expect to hear from you at your early convenience? And, if besides your personal contribution, you could promote our object in any way among our fellow countrymen, to whom you have access, and whom we may fail to reach, we shall be so much the more your debtors, in behalf of those whose cause we advocate—who are your kinsfolk and ours according to the flesh, and who are “beloved for the Fathers’ sake.”

We have the honour to remain,

Dear Sir,

Your Obedient and Faithful Servants,

JAMES C. BURNS, } *Honorary Sec-*  
JAMES HAMILTON, } *retaries.*

### 3.—PROPOSED PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL IN LONDON. •

(*Extract from a private letter.*)

I had a good deal of conversation with———before his departure for Scotland, in reference to a subject which he along with many, both here and in other parts of the country, consider to be of the first importance—I mean the long-spoken of establishment of a Presbyterian Newspaper in London. I regret being unable to send you a prospectus, as it is not yet printed, though it will be so in a few days. I may mention however that it is to be connected with no political party, and that its grand object will be to bring religion to bear upon State affairs, to leaven the mind of the country, with sound principles, religious, ecclesiastical, educational and economical, and so to change the representation of the popular will, as to secure a consistent and powerful advocacy of those principles in Parliament. It is purposed to start the Newspaper about the middle of November.

### 4.—RIOTOUS PROCEEDINGS.

We learn with much regret, but with no surprise, that there have been some riotous proceedings in the North of Scotland, in connexion with the induction of certain new men into the freshly vacated Churches. We wait for particulars as to details; but as to the mere fact, it need excite no wonder. The Free Church cause, whilst it has attached to it the great mass of Scotland's piety, by its peculiarly spiritual claims, has also drawn along with it many worldly people, whose minds have only been affected by an instinctive perception of mere natural right or wrong, and who evidently saw that the

Church was shamefully and unjustly treated; and no more than this it may be, did many of them see, although in this they saw most truly. Now, it is evident, that such minds will of necessity be open to modes of action which will savour more of passion than of principle; and that, if a small spark do but touch a little of their tinder, the community may soon be in a blaze, by latent sympathies, or irresistible entanglements. The Highlanders too have this immediate sense of rights, natural and traditional rights, rights which they cannot explain, but which they can and do *feel*:—and their nature is immediately to do what they think, to accomplish what they suppose to be just. This has often brought them into collision with civil authority:—and it will be well, if things end here now. Glad we are to find it acknowledged that the Free Church Ministers have done what they could to check excesses—and we are sure that their influence will be quite adequate with their own immediate and real adherents; they have conjured up nothing that they cannot control:—nor will the Lord suffer his cause to be *justly* evil-spoken of.

It gives us pleasure, on this point, to be able to give an example of what we say—in the following extract from a usually hostile quarter:—

“Some alarm had been entertained with respect to the settlement at Kiltarn. There were about sixty persons in the church, and the whole proceeding passed off in the most quiet and peaceable manner. It is mentioned that the Revd. Dr. Macdonald (of the Free Church) Ferrintosh, while preaching in Gaelic on the Sunday previous, strongly inculcated the necessity of the people conducting themselves with decorum, and even went so far as to say, that he would refuse all church privileges to such as should take any part in creating disturbance. We have no doubt this admonition had the best effect.”

## 5.—FINANCIAL PRESSURE.

It is said that the Ministers of the Free Church, are now beginning to feel the painful pressure arising from the want of Funds adequate to the support of the Ministry generally through the country. We have no doubt, and have had no doubt, that this was and will be one of the test of sincerity in our cause. We know that the Missionaries of the Free Church *here*, were prepared (and are still, if need be) for this probable and anticipated result of secession to an extent beyond what their most intimate friends were ever, or ever will be, aware of: and we have no doubt that it was so at home also. Had the Scottish Ministers been careful only for themselves, and devoted themselves to the *sustentation* Fund, as they have to the Building Fund to procure Churches for their flocks, how secure might they have been, wrapped up in their flocks' fleeces? They preferred the better part however—and the Lord will not desert, though He may and will try them. He has done wonders *for* them, and we have no doubt that He will do wonders *in* and by them. To them who so love His Son, he will not deny His Spirit. The following extract of a letter, received by a Friend in Calcutta, from a late Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, dated September last, illustrates this state of things, and shews what good men at home feel, desire and expect chiefly. “You are, I make no doubt, fully aware of the state of things in this land, and I believe at one with us who have gone out of the Established Church. A great honour has been put upon us; and yet it would not be easy to set forth all our sufferings and trials. But I trust and believe that the Lord will bring about great results.

There is an encouraging stirring up of men's minds—a more extensive preaching of the Word—and almost everywhere an earnest desire to hear. Let us trust that these are tokens for good, and commit unto the Lord the work that is his own. Of course, I am out of my manse—but still remaining in my Parish. There is a large portion of the people that adhere to me—but the pressure against the Free Church is very strong, and the carnal among the people easily yield to it. You and your Brethren in the East will have your own difficulties—but I trust the Lord will give you grace to be faithful. May His Kingdom come in power and great glory!"

#### 6.—DR. CHALMERS' PROSPECTS.

Dr. Chalmers, who takes charge of the financial department of the Free Church, has been making a northern tour, for the purpose of raising money. After visiting Perth, Aberdeen, Montrose, Arbroath, &c., he arrived on the 20th ult., at Dundee, where he held a meeting in the United Secession Chapel, and was next morning entertained at a public breakfast in the Thistle Hall. The following are extracts from the reverend doctor's speech on this occasion, wherein he entered very fully into the financial affairs of the Free Church:

"He then came to the financial prospects of the Free Church; and on this subject he held that they had more dependence on the sturdiness of the peasantry of Scotland, than on the munificent and splendid donations they had received or might yet obtain from the wealthy and aristocratic in aid of their cause. Prior to the disruption, no doubt, many had come forward handsomely, and their subscriptions sounded magnificently. One of his own acquaintances had come forward with £500 a-year, another with £200, and a third with £50, and so on. He had made an inquiry about a week before leaving Edinburgh, and found the total of these subscriptions to amount to about £9,000. Now, there were 778 parochial associations, and averaging these at £88 yearly, the sum which might be safely expected from each, they had from these smaller offerings a sum seven times larger than the donations from the rich cast into the treasury—amounting to £68,000 a-year. Previous to the disruption, the cry had been, on the part of the aristocracy, "Go out, and show the people that you are sincere." Well, they had gone out; they had done the very thing which they were wanted—they had done all they were asked; and his great surprise was that, on applying to those who had recommended this course, they found them as short in the temper as ever. They could place more dependence on Dick Campbell, the shoemaker, or on Gilbert, the tailor, or on retired butlers, than on all they might expect from the rich and the noble. In the parish where he resided—Morningside—numbering about 1,600, and whose inhabitants were generally in no better circumstances than the citizens of Dundee, an association which had been got up amongst them, on its first formation, produced about £6 per week. It had since made a steady advance, and there was now collected about £7, 12s. weekly, or £360 a-year. This was no solitary instance, as might be evidenced from the case of many other parishes in Scotland; and taking the inhabitants of his native country at 2,600,000, and this as a criterion of their contributions, the munificent sum of half a million sterling would be raised annually in support of the great cause of the moral and religious education, not only of the towns and wealthy parts, but also of the poorer districts of Scotland. If they failed, it would be from no want of good will



on the part of the generous-minded peasantry; but simply because one individual out of a hundred could not be found to devote one half-hour per week to gathering together their collections. Humanly speaking, the means were in their own power to secure the triumph of the Free Church, and the establishment of a pure evangelical ministry in the land; in preference to the triumph of a Residuary Church, with its cold Moderation and blighting influence on all their holiest aspirations. The reverend doctor referred to several other associations, as proofs of his assertions, among others to those of Newhaven and Lesswalt, and to that of Abernethy in the Dundee presbytery, where, two or three years ago, when there was no extraordinary excitement, such as the disruption to impel them to increased exertions, and where the number did not exceed 300, and the highest weekly subscription was only 6d., the sum annually raised in aid of the Assembly's schemes was £87. Calculating the whole of Scotland to contribute in an equal proportion, the magnificent amount of £70,000 would be raised—not only in aid of the Free Church (for he set no value upon any particular church), but in aid of the best and highest interests of the people of Scotland. He would like to see Scotland a congeries of Morningsides or of Newhavens; and they would not stop short with four hundred and seventy new churches—the number of ministers who had retired—nor with eight hundred places of Worship for the congregations which were already formed, but would plant, throughout the length and breadth of the land, churches and schools to supply the religious and educational wants of the people. The doctor then referred to the case of Mr. Law's congregation in Dundee, an example with which he was very much impressed. The greater part of Mr. Law's members were common sailors, and he had succeeded in raising £900 for the purpose of building a church for their accommodation. This sum had not all been obtained from sailors, however, as part had been got from the upper classes—many of them Moderates; and he must say it to their honour, that, although obtained previous to the disruption, now, when Mr. Law had left along with the Free Church, so impressed were they with the value of his services among the seamen, that they had made no attempt to deprive him of these subscriptions. Mr. Law had got a good working association; and the collections at the church doors amounted every Sabbath to betwixt 25s. and 30s.—a large sum, considering the poor class among whom it was raised. Mr. Law, in conversing with him, had mentioned one fact, which entirely coincided with his own experience—that females were by far the most efficient collectors, being naturally more zealous and assiduous than the other sex, who had their business, their shop, or other affairs to attend to. The ladies have always been the civilizers of mankind; and to those who look beneath the surface, the visits of the female collectors to the families of the common people, irrespective altogether of the subscriptions they obtained, would have an elevating and moralizing tendency which might be more valuable than silver and gold. It had been objected that taking subscriptions from the poor had the effect of impoverishing them; but he felt assured that the very circumstance of their giving 2d. or 3d. to promote the spread of the Gospel was a guarantee that they should not squander upon sinful or worthless indulgences their means; and thus, instead of being worse, they would be much better off by the great reformation in their moral habits.

---

THE  
FREE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. I.]

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1843.

[No. 7.]

LECTURES ON THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, &c.

APPENDIX OR SUPPLEMENT I.—*Examples or specimens, illustrative of the recent Erastian encroachments of the Court of Session.* SEE PAGE 276.

In the text it was been stated that a complete enumeration of all the cases of recent encroachment, on the part of the Court of Session, would fill whole volumes. And no one, who is tolerably acquainted with the rise and progress of the recent controversy, can for a moment doubt this to be a *literal fact*. In such a case, all that could be overtaken, within our restricted limits, was, to reduce the series of Erastian invasions to a few distinct classes, and rest satisfied with the bare announcement of these. We now proceed, as proposed in the Note page 276, to furnish one or two examples or specimens, with the view simply of illustrating the peculiar nature and distinguishing character of each class. Even in attempting this very limited task, we have to study *brevity*; since, were all the windings and turnings of any single case to be tracked and delineated, the narration would occupy more space than we propose to allot to the whole. Of each case, only such prominent or salient points will be noticed, as are essential to render it generally intelligible. In making the selection of cases, we have endeavoured to seize on those, which, from a combination of circumstances, partly accidental and partly inevitable, acquired the greatest notoriety. But, in the arrangement of them, there is no reference to historical order of succession, or other *minutiae* connected with time and place.

1st.—*The Court of Session gave decisions by which the surviving liberties of the Christian people were utterly subverted.*

A parish becomes vacant. If the presentee be submitted to the approval of members in full communion with the Church, it is known that he will be rejected. To prevent any steps from being taken at all, the Court of Session is applied to for an interdict to prohibit the communicants from intimating their dissent. It is at once granted. Thus, under the threatened penalty of fines and imprisonment, which a violation of such interdict involves, the Christian people are debarred from the exercise of a right, which hitherto was always understood to be as fully conceded by the Statute Law of the land as it is unquestionably conferred by the Statute Book of Heaven. There is no alternative between a relinquishment, under civil

coercion, of scriptural and statutory rights, and a voluntary submission to persecuting penalties. The type of such cases is that of *Daviot*. And if the first Auchterarder decision *theoretically* nullified the liberties of the Christian people; the case of *Daviot* *practically* laid them prostrate in the dust. If the former pronounced the exercise of them to be as impotent of good as the recalcitration of the Champion's horse on the coronation day; the latter constituted the exercise of them a crime to be visited with penal severities.\*

2nd.—*All extension and enlargement of the Church, in obedience to the Divine command, was completely arrested.*

The population of a parish has greatly increased. The necessities of the spiritually destitute become clamant. They are fast sinking into downright heathenism. What then is to be done? Is the Christian Church to witness multitudes within her borders, in a state of famine and ready to perish; and will she refuse to stretch forth her hands to their rescue? A reviving Church cannot be so criminally negligent. Funds are liberally collected for the building of new Churches. Acceptable ministers are appointed, with warrant to form Kirk-sessions for the exercise of *purely scriptural discipline*. A section of a city or rural district is marked out for their spiritual supervision. No new burden is attempted to be laid on the Heritors. No encroachment is proposed on the unexhausted tithes. No civil right, or civil property whatsoever is, in any way, affected. All is of a purely spiritual and Ecclesiastical character. Hence, were the parishes designated, *quoad sacra* parishes, and the ministers, *quoad sacra* ministers,—to distinguish them from *quoad civilia* parishes, or such as had temporalities or benefices. Thus, was the Church vigorously proceeding, in obedience to the divine command, and in conformity to rights recognized by statute law, and constantly practised without interruption since the days of the Reformation;—when, on the application of certain unfavourably disposed persons, the Court of Session first interdicted, and next pronounced illegal, the appointment of additional ministers to meet the wants of extensive parishes and an overgrown population—illegalizing, at the same time, the formation of any new Kirk-sessions for the exercise of spiritual discipline,—and disallowing the right of the *quoad sacra* ministers to sit and deliberate with their co-presbyters, as Members of Church Courts. Thus, was the Church fairly stereotyped—all further progress, or extension of the means of grace being completely arrested—and the myriads of a spiritually destitute people coolly consigned to ignorance and vice, starvation and death. The type of all such cases was that of *Stewarton*.

3rd.—*All ordinary spiritual discipline and Ecclesiastical order was entirely destroyed.*

An unworthy minister is charged with repeated acts of petty theft. The

---

\* The practical effect of this decision has been thus pointedly stated by Mr. Begg of Liberton. "No man can serve two masters. Now, our Master in heaven says expressly to his people, 'Beware of false prophets'—'Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits.' The Civil Court says, 'ye shall not try the spirits; that is entirely left to secular Patrons and servile Presbyteries. Ye are mere children—ye are mere slaves—ye shall not beware of false prophets—ye shall receive any man as your minister whom a Patron may present and a Presbytery intrude, although you are thoroughly convinced that he is an incompetent hireling, who careth not for the sheep; nay, although you have seen him change his principles to secure the temporalities of the benefice, and thus, worse than Esau, sell your birth-right as well as his own for a mess of pottage.' It is proper to add that the utter illegality of such a decision, as that given by the Court of Session in the case of *Daviot*, has subsequently been formally proved by Lord Aberdeen's Bill.

proofs are redundant. He is found guilty. Judgment is accordingly pronounced upon him, in which at first he himself fully acquiesces. He is to be deposed from the holy office which he had so flagrantly dishonoured. Stirred up, however, by evil counsellors, he at last flies for protection to the Court of Session. And out comes an interdict against the Spiritual Courts pronouncing, upon him the sentence of deposition! The type of such cases is that of *Cambusnethan*. Another unworthy minister is accused, on ample grounds, of fraud and swindling; and out comes an interdict from the Court of Session prohibiting the Presbytery from proceeding with his trial. Such was the *Stranraer* case. Again, an unworthy licentiate of the Church is about to be libelled for drunkenness, obscenity, and profane swearing; and out comes an interdict from the Court of Session against proceeding with the libel. Such was the *fourth Lethendy* case. Once more,—a Presbytery holds a meeting in a Parish Church. Its proceedings are disturbed by the disgraceful, insulting and uproarious conduct of a *drunken* farmer, who had been an unworthy communicant of the Church. He is soon after very properly served with a regular and formal citation by the officer of the Presbytery, to appear before them on a certain day, “to answer to the charge against him for the sin and scandal of appearing in their presence in the Church, in a state of intoxication, and disturbing and interrupting the proceedings of the Presbytery.” This citation the guilty man entirely disregards. It is repeated *three* times in succession, with considerable intervals between. All of these he treats with contempt. He is then told that if, after a certain date, he persist in such conduct, he must be dealt with for incorrigible contumacy. Still continuing to persevere in his sinful and contumacious course, he is at length, “in conformity with the laws and practice of the Church, *excommunicated* from the Church.” If he felt himself aggrieved by this righteous sentence, an appeal was open to him, to the Synod and General Assembly. But, instead of appealing, in a matter *purely spiritual*, to the superior Ecclesiastical Judicatories, he goes at once and directly to that *Civil Tribunal* which had now begun to assume the *entire spiritual functions* of the Church, and supersede them altogether. The prayer of his “Note” is to the effect, that the Court would “*suspend the said pretended sentence of excommunication, and whole proceedings on which it is grounded; and interdict, prohibit, and discharge the Presbytery and all others from executing, or acting on, or in any manner of way giving effect to, said pretended sentence, or from molesting, obstructing, or disturbing the complainer in the enjoyment and exercise of all his privileges as a member of the Established Church of Scotland;*” in other words, that their Lordships of Session would *suspend the purely spiritual sentence of excommunication, pronounced on a drunken and contumacious private member, and restore him to his full spiritual rights and privileges, as a communicant!*—or, *what is the same thing still, force an immoral character to the Lord’s table in defiance of the Church!* And, (will it be credited?) *the interdict was granted!!* This was the *Barry* case.\*

\* The frightful effects of these decisions have been tersely represented somewhat as follows:—Christ says, “if any man that is called a brother be a drunkard, &c., with such an one, *do not eat.*” The Court of Session says, “Though a man come staggering drunk into your Church Courts, we shall force you to eat with him,—we shall thrust him back to your communion table, and force the ministers of Christ to break the sacred bread, and to give it into his polluted hands.” Christ says, “A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject.” The Civil Courts say, “No matter how heretical a man may be, both in theory and practice, ye shall not be suffered to reject him; we shall keep the convicted thieves, and drunkards, and debauchees, and profane swearers and heretics in their pulpits in defiance of you. And although God says unto the wicked, *What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldst take my covenant in thy mouth?*—we shall supply an answer, by interposing our authority as that, in virtue of which he shall still desecrate the sacred office.”

The technical pretext for such flagrant interference with the course of ecclesiastical discipline, only aggravated the offence. It was the preposterous one, that the Church, in virtue of a spiritual jurisdiction which, except in persecuting times, had been uninterruptedly exercised since the Reformation, had admitted into her Courts the ministers and elders of newly appointed churches! For, even if the Church had erred in this, as she did not, but acted solely in accordance with the word of God, the Confession of faith, and the statutes of the realm—it was a purely gratuitous insult for a subordinate secular Court to interfere with her *purely spiritual discipline*. And it was monstrous in the eye of Christendom and of the nations to proclaim, that it would compel the continuance of the convicted thief, the convicted drunkard, the convicted adulterer, the convicted heretic in the office of the holy ministry, and at the same time compel the exclusion of the godly ministers and elders of newly erected Churches, from the Courts, or Ecclesiastical Assemblies of their Brethren! But, besides the baseless technical objection, it was broadly asserted in the “Note,” on the Barry case, that it was competent for their Lordships of Session “to quash any sentence pronounced by Presbyteries;”—the practical application of which doctrine, in a case like the present being, that “the Court of Session are, in reality, the judges of who shall, and who shall not, be admitted to the Lord’s table!”—“*They shall pass over my dead body first,*” said Calvin, when the Civil authorities at Geneva attempted similar measures, “*rather than I shall consent to admit men to the table of my Lord, at the dictation of any civil tribunal.*”

4th.—*All the most sacred rites and ordinances of the Christian faith were sacrilegiously interfered with.*

Several parishes become vacant by the deposition of ministers from an office which they had scandalously desecrated. The General Assembly, as the constitutional guardian of the spiritual interests of the people, appoint several of the most godly and venerated pastors of the Church, to preach the word of God, and administer the gospel ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s Supper within the vacated districts. Out comes an interdict from the Court of Session, prohibiting them from doing so within the Parish Church, the Church-yard, or School-house. These being public property over which the Court had control, the interdict was implicitly obeyed—however arbitrary, tyrannous, or unconstitutional it might be proved to be. But from preaching the gospel, or administering ordinances, to a famishing people, the ministers of the Church did not, could not, dared not, refrain. So, carefully avoiding the Parish Church, Church-yard, and School-house, they assembled the willing hearers in halls, or barns, or dells, or on the hill-side, under the blue canopy of heaven,—and there they rehearsed the praises of Jehovah, or proclaimed his message of salvation, or celebrated the sacramental solemnities. Awakenings and conversions ensued. Hundreds were turned from darkness to light. And the angels around the throne rejoiced over many repenting and returning to their God. Earth was glad and heaven re-echoed the glad acclaim. But, lo, in the midst of scenes which awakened the joys of Paradise, forth comes a fresh interdict from the Court of Session to arrest the whole, by prohibiting the gospel from being preached, or ordinances administered, within the bounds of these reviving and refreshed districts at all! These impious interferences were common to all the *Strathgogie* cases.

\* It would not be difficult to conjecture, whence this order must have emanated, as its primordial source! Christ says, “go and preach the gospel to every creature.” The Court of Session says, “No, there are some parts of the world into which ye shall not

5th.—*All spiritual, independent, jurisdiction and government was laid prostrate in the dust.*

*First.* A parish becomes vacant. A minister is presented. Amid many irregularities, on the part of the Presbytery, and complaints and protests, on the part of the people, he is settled as pastor of the Parish. Many difficulties, as well as grave and important doubts, arise about the validity of his settlement. In such a case, what could the Assembly, the Supreme Judicatory of the Church, do, but review the whole proceeding with a view to determine the points in debate? And, *pending the discussion of the cause in the Church Courts*, what could the Assembly do less, than, according to reason, and justice, and immemorial usage, prohibit, in the mean while, the said minister from preaching and administering ordinances within the parish, the validity of whose appointment to which was now so vehemently contested? Well; and what does the Court of Session, in the discharge of its newly usurped ecclesiastical functions, do, but issue an interdict prohibiting the execution of this reasonable, constitutional, and lawful sentence of the General Assembly? Here was a fatal thrust, at the independent spiritual jurisdiction of the Church. The type of such cases is that of *Culsalmund*.

*Second.* A parish becomes vacant. The Crown presents an unordained licentiate of the church. He is rejected by the people. The Crown acquiesces and presents another. The latter is found most acceptable, and the Presbytery resolve to ordain him. To get rid of all doubts and difficulties about any disputed claims of the former to the benefice—he is to be ordained with no reference to the temporalities at all. From any claim to stipend, manse, glebe, or ought else, involving, directly or indirectly, any real or pretended patrimonial right, he is wholly excluded. He is to support himself, or be supported by his people, as they best can. In short, with nothing civil or temporal is there any interference, either expressly or by implication. He is simply to be ordained and inducted into the *spiritual* oversight of the parish—that the people may not be scattered as sheep, having no shepherd. But, just as the purely spiritual appointment to a purely spiritual office, irrespective altogether of the civil benefice previously attached thereto, is to take effect, out comes an interdict from the Court of Session, at the instigation of the rejected Presentee, prohibiting the Presbytery from proceeding with the purely spiritual and ecclesiastical service. The Commission of the General Assembly almost unanimously determine to resist this new and monstrous encroachment on the jurisdiction and spiritual independence of the Church. Even some of the more respectable of the Moderates were scandalized at it. And one venerable Father, (Dr. Brunton) amongst them, with emphasis declared, “that he would never submit to the interference of the Civil Courts in such matters.” The interdict was consequently disobeyed as wholly incompetent and inept—as, *ab initio*, null and

---

go, and many creatures there to whom ye shall not preach” Christ says, “go and teach all, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” The Court of Session says, “No; there are thousands of individuals in certain districts of this land whom ye shall not teach, neither shall ye baptize, though pressing into the Kingdom of heaven, and the promise is unto them and their children.” Christ says, “Do this in remembrance of me.” The Court of Session says, “No; there are numbers of professing disciples in certain parishes of this land who shall not be allowed the opportunity of doing this in remembrance of their crucified but risen Lord!” And thus, as stated in the claim of Right, did the Court of Session, not merely assume to itself the regulation of the “preaching of the word” and “administration of sacraments,” but also, at the same time, “invaded the privilege, common to all the subjects of the British Crown, of having freedom to worship God according to their consciences, and under the guidance of the ministers of the communion to which they belong.”

void. And what was the result? The majority of the Presbytery, for the performance of a purely spiritual Act in obedience to their ecclesiastical superiors, are summoned to the metropolis—dragged before civil tribunals—placed at the bar as felons—and there rebuked by the supreme civil judges of the land, with a severity suited only to some heinous crime; yea, and moreover, are threatened, in no ambiguous terms, with the farther visitation of fines and imprisonment. Christ says, "Appoint faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." The Court of Session says, you shall appoint faithful men at your peril; rather than appoint such, you must allow the parish to be overrun with heathenism; rather than appoint such, you must suffer the unhappy sheep to become the prey of ravenous wolves;—and if, after this warning, ye presume to appoint such, ye must be visited with condign punishment." Of such instances of flagrant interference with the independent spiritual jurisdiction of the church, the type is the first *Lethendy* case.

*Third.* A parish becomes vacant. A presentee, who after three years previous probation, as an assistant, rendered himself universally obnoxious to the people, is cordially, and with one solitary and not very creditable exception, unanimously rejected. The Patron acquiesces and appoints another, in accordance with the wishes of the people. The rejected candidate applies to, and obtains from, the Court of Session, first an interdict against the Presbytery proceeding to settle the acceptable presentee; and secondly, an order *declaring* that they were bound to take himself on trials, and admit him, though as yet a layman and unordained, to the office of the holy ministry;—in other words, a declaratory order or virtual decree for violently intruding him on the congregation, contrary to the will of the people. Here—though pains and penalties were not yet formally named as the consequence of refusal, as in other cases they soon came to be so named,—was a direct and fatal blow levelled at the exclusive spiritual jurisdiction of the Church in a matter of all others the most purely spiritual—the examination and admission of candidates to the office of the holy ministry. Christ says, "Lay hands suddenly on no man; and be not partaker of other men's sins." The Court of Session says, "but ye shall lay hands suddenly on any man whom we please; and ye shall do so, even though thoroughly persuaded in your own minds, that, by such act, ye commit aggravated sin yourselves, and be guilty partakers of the sins of others." The type of such cases is that of *Marnoch*, or the first *Strathbogie* case.

*Fourth.* But the Marnoch case did not stop here. The majority of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, within whose bounds Marnoch was, happened to be not merely Moderates, but men, "fierce for Moderation." These, with Erastian servility, now found and declared, contrary to their own Standards and Statute Law, that the Court of Session had jurisdiction in the induction of ministers, and that they were bound to obey them. The General Assembly and its Commission—which is a Committee of the whole House, that meets from time to time as the exigencies of the Church may require—anxious to avoid farther collision, ordered the Presbytery not to settle the acceptable presentee, and wholly to exclude the other—pending the negotiations with Government, then in apparently favourable progress towards an ultimate settlement of the whole question. Thus relieved for a time, of all risk and responsibility by their Ecclesiastical superiors, who entirely assumed such risk and responsibility to themselves, the Presbytery of Strathbogie ought, by every consideration of duty and expediency, the most sacred, to have stayed further proceedings. But the majority, altogether ultroneously and without being under any immediate compulsory obligation of the Civil Power, resolved contumaciously and

causlessly not to obtemper the instructions of the authority which, by solemn ordination vows, it was bound to obey; and at the same time, to take its orders from a Civil Court whose interference in all spiritual things it was sacredly bound to resist. All that kind entreaty, remonstrance, exposition, and friendly conference could do, was attempted;—but in vain. With a chivalrous and heroic contempt of ordination vows, ecclesiastical obedience, public opinion, the spiritual independence of the church, and the rights and liberties of its members, they announced their resolute determination to ordain and induct the obnoxious presentee that had been abandoned by his Patron, and forcibly intrude him on a reclaiming people. To prevent this great scandal and sin, which would have irretrievably committed the perpetrators themselves and plunged the Church into a new vortex of perplexing embarrassments—the Commission of Assembly, not by way of vengeance, not by way of punishment, but by way of *prevention* and in mercy to the unhappy men themselves, resolved to suspend them *temporarily* from exercising any of the functions of the Holy Ministry, and thus incapacitate them for the performance of any purely ministerial or ecclesiastical act. When thus suspended, for deliberate contumacy and violation of the laws of the Church, how do they,—who, at their ordination, solemnly swore and vowed “to submit themselves, willingly and humbly, in the spirit of meekness, unto the admonition of the brethren of the Presbytery, and to be subject to them, and all other superior judicatories of the Church”—implement their solemn oath and vow? By meek and humble submission? No; but by resistance and defiance. Yea, more; having been suspended from the discharge of ministerial functions by the Ecclesiastical authority that had conferred the right to exercise them, they now apply to the Civil Power, which at once daringly cancelled the censure inflicted by the Church, by way of discipline; and reposed these suspended ministers to the full ministerial character and office!—thus assuming to themselves and usurping “the power of the keys” or the sacred department of spiritual authority. This was the *second Strathbogie case*.

*Fifth.* But, the case did not stop even here. Whatever the Court of Session, in its rampant mood of setting aside all former precedents and dispising all former interpretations of Statute-law, might be disposed to *permit* or *sanction* under its tyrannous and usurping authority, it is clear as day, that the suspended ministers were under no *legal* or *conscientious obligation* to apply to a Civil Court for the removal of *spiritual censure* and the conferment of *spiritual authority*. In this they sinned—sinned grievously—against the laws and constitution of Christ’s Kingdom and the prerogatives of his Crown. What, then, could the General Assembly do next? When it found these contumacious and rebellious sons guilty,—while “under no obligation to do so, not coerced, not controlled, but in their ambition to retain that office of which their ecclesiastical superiors had deprived them, as they alone bestowed it,—guilty, of going to another Court, not of Christ at all, but a Court of Cæsar, and asking from Cæsar the keys of Christ’s Kingdom, which the Church of Christ alone can give:”—when it found them thus “dispensing ordinances without a warrant; usurping the power of the keys, when no power competent to give these keys put them into their hands; desecrating the ordinances of Christ, and of the sacraments which he has instituted, which he has ordained to be dispensed by the hands of the ministers of his word, duly called thereto, and which these men, who, for the time, were no ministers at all, had dared to touch:”—when it found them, while thus lawfully, constitutionally, and

\* Dr. Candlish’s Speech at the Commission of the General Assembly, August, 1840.



ecclesiastically deprived of the ministerial character and office, engaged in trampling under foot the honour of the Redeemer, the most sacred institutions of his House and the most precious rights and privileges of its members, by profaning the sacred rite of ordination, forcing an obnoxious layman into the office of a dishonoured ministry, and driving nearly the whole population of a Parish, in a mass, from the church where their fathers had for ages worshipped, and around which was deposited the hallowed dust of kindred and beloved friends—softly slumbering till the resurrection morn:—When the General Assembly found men intently engaged in proceedings of so heinous and so aggravated a character:—when it found them despise all law and resist all authority, disdain all admonition and turn a deaf ear to all reproof, treat all forbearance with derision and the tenderest counsels with contumely and scorn:—in a word, when it found them persisting and persevering, with a desperate and incorrigible contumacy, in heaping wrong upon wrong, and transgression upon transgression, what could it do?—what possible, or conceivable alternative lay before it, but to *depose* them altogether from the office of the ministry? And when the awfully solemn sentence of *deposition* was pronounced in a full Assembly of the church, amid high exercises of humiliation and prayer, and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Great Head of the Church—what do the bold and iron-hearted men of Strathbogie do? They apply afresh to their new ecclesiastical superiors, the Civil Judges of the Court of Session—obtain a civil interdict to stay the execution of the spiritual sentence—and civil authority to reduce and set aside the sentence of deposition from the holy ministry, as well as to sustain them in the exercise of all their ministerial functions. Thus were the highest offices of the Church of Christ daringly assumed by a Court of Cæsar. For that Court, which could presume to restore ecclesiastical functions to men deprived of them by the competent spiritual authorities whence alone they were originally derived, might just as well undertake to confer them from the beginning;—and thus might the Court of Session, by the issuing of simple edicts and decrees, become the general Fount and Reservoir of ordination to all the new ministers in the land, and so dispense with the useless apparatus of ecclesiastical functionaries altogether! Such were the *third and fourth Strathbogie cases*.

It is needless to pursue the painful subject any further. These examples, together with the *second Auchterarder* decision already given in the text, are amply sufficient to shew what we MEAN, when we refer, with abhorrence, to the recent Erastianizing encroachments of the Court of Session. And the reader will now be better prepared to appreciate the summary supplied by the CLAIM OF RIGHT, adopted by the *last Free Assembly* of the *Established Church* in 1842, when it went to the foot of the British throne, solemnly declaring that, by all these Acts, the Court of Session, “apparently not adverting to the oath taken by the sovereign from whom they hold their commissions, have exercised powers not conferred on them by the constitution, but by it excluded from the province of any secular tribunal—have subverted its government—have illegally attempted to coerce Church Courts in the exercise of their purely spiritual functions—have usurped the power of the keys—have wrongfully acclaimed, as the subjects of their civil jurisdiction, to be regulated by their decrees, ordination of laymen to the office of the holy ministry, admission to the cure of souls, church censures, the preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments—and have employed the means entrusted to them for enforcing submission to their lawful authority, in compelling submission to that which they have usurped,—in opposition to the doctrine of God’s word, set forth in the Confession of Faith, as ratified by statute,—in violation of the constitution—in breach of the Treaty of Union—and in disregard of diverse express enactments

of the Legislature." Thanks be to God, that,—while to all this Erastian tyranny the *Moderate Church Establishment of Scotland* has slavishly submitted—from it the *FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND* has been gloriously delivered!

## II.—LETTER OF AN EPISCOPALIAN FRIEND ON THE FREE CHURCH QUESTION.

[*This is what it professes to be, a letter from one friend within the Episcopalian Church to another, on the merits of the Scottish Church Question—it is, in fact, a genuine production. It has been forwarded to us at the request of third parties; and we gladly insert it, as the high-toned expression of most sincere and dispassionate conviction flowing from the writer's own mind—and as enabling us to introduce in a most effective form to our readers the generous and pure sympathies of the much esteemed and spiritually minded BICKERSTETH.*]

MY DEAR ———, I have received your note of the 23rd, and again trouble you with a letter, not to repeat my application for a subscription, but to endeavour to draw your mind to a fuller consideration of the subject to which our recent correspondence refers.

You say, "for my own part I do not sufficiently understand the subject, (viz., the causes which have led to the recent disruption of the National Church of Scotland,) but, &c." This is the reply which I have received from more than one. Pardon my candour when I say that the subject is one of which the members of our church should not be ignorant. It affects them more nearly than many are wont to imagine; and the time may not be far distant when the Church of England may be compelled to consider the principles involved in the recent struggle of her northern sister of the Reformation as of more direct and personal consequence to herself than at present is generally recognized. But were it otherwise, surely the subject is one which deserves a patient investigation and the fullest enquiry at our hands. The causes which have led to the dismemberment of one of the purest (if not the very purest) of the reformed churches, to the relinquishment for conscience sake, by half the Ministers of a National Church, of house and home, of station and emolument; to the separation of a million of souls from the Church of their fathers, a church to which they were devotedly attached, surely demand some consideration at our hands. Nor does this obligation lose any of its force when we reflect that the seceders include among their number, I will not say all, but the greater portion of the pious of the land, and some of the master-spirits of the age, men to whom before the secession took place, the world was ready enough to do homage, but whom, now that it has taken place, it brands as zealots and enthusiasts. The event, remarkable as it is in its character, and pregnant with results so momentous, ought to arrest the attention of Christians of every Church and denomination, and meet with attentive and prayerful consideration.

And is there no place here for the exercise of Christian sympathy?

Shall Christian men sacrifice their all for Christ's sake, and for the maintenance of His authority over His blood-bought Church, and we remain heedless and unmoved? When they ask our sympathy, shall we not cheer them, and bid them God speed? When their cause seeks our support, shall we meet them with a cold "we do not understand you?" Would that the members of the communion to which you and I belong, attended more fully to the recommendation of a burning and a shining light of our own Church. Thus writes Bickersteth, three months before the secession took place, "I cannot but recommend the members of our Established Churches in England and Ireland, to seek to understand the principles at issue in this controversy, and the really painful position of faithful Scotch Brethren in the ministry, and I feel assured that they would show sympathy with such conscientious sufferers, and pour out much prayer for them."

The grand principle for which the Church of Scotland has recently been contending, is that of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ. Whatever form it may have taken in any of its practical details, such as intrusion of ministers upon reclaiming congregations, or of resistance to Cæsar when he would have seized upon the things that are God's, this is the leading and primary principle involved in the contest. Whatever aspect the struggle may have assumed in the various stages of its progress to the final disruption of the National Establishment, those who have now separated from the State-church of Scotland, have throughout been guided and directed by this leading principle, and animated by a holy resolution to maintain the authority and prerogative of the one Supreme Head of His Church.

It is not my present purpose to enter into any lengthened remarks as to the scriptural character of the principle contended for. You will find its true nature fully set forth and clearly established in the various publications which I have sent to you. Read attentively Dr. Duff's first Lecture; but above all turn to your Bible, and in the spirit of prayer and of unprejudiced and impartial judgment, ascertain for yourself whether the principle asserted by the seceders be not scripturally right.

But in case it should appear to you that you are not likely to arrive at a satisfactory judgment of the real matter at issue, between the moderate and evangelical parties, by a perusal of publications chiefly from the pen of writers who are personally interested in the contest, I give you an extract from Bickersteth, who, of all the Ministers of the Church of England, appears to have paid the most attention to the character of the struggle in the Scottish Church, and who certainly may be considered as an impartial writer, as he assuredly is an authority of the soundest judgment in such matters. Writing before the secession took place, he thus expresses himself in his preface to his "*Restoration of the Jews*." "The author ventures also farther to avail himself of this opportunity of expressing interest and sympathy in the present situation of the Scottish Church. It is a most touching and heart-interesting cause to contend for the most scriptural

of all means of doing good, a pure and efficient gospel ministry, to struggle for the right solution of the most difficult, perhaps, of all problems in the present state of the Church of Christ, while on its way to its high destinies, the maintenance of such a ministry in its spiritual character, wholly and avowedly under the exclusive dominion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and independant of the state; and yet in connection with that state and dependant upon it, in reference to its worldly support! and this, after being robbed of its endowments by the rapacity of past ages. The coming glory of the Kingdom of Christ will solve this difficulty in that perfected union and the entire combination of Church and State, which we wait for, in the Kingdom of Him, who is at once Prophet, Priest, and King of his people. The Church of Scotland appears in its constitution to have approached very near to the just limits of the present respective spheres of Church and State; but here, as elsewhere, we see and are compelled to acknowledge the present infirmities of the visible Church. All power, vested in human trusteeship, is liable to abuse, and no doubt such a power as the General Assembly seeks to maintain, may be abused! as it appeared to the author to have been in the condemnation and deposition of Mr. Campbell in 1831, for what seemed to the author rather verbal inaccuracies than fundamental errors. But, however, in the opinion of some the General Assembly may have been formally wrong in any step which may have incidentally augmented their present difficulties, their great principles and their grand aim are scripturally right and of immense importance, and hence their present situation demands our lively interest and our earnest intercessions. I would pray therefore for them, that in the progress of this difficult and painful conflict, special wisdom and firmness, with patience and forbearance, may be given to our sister Church. I trust there may be opportunities opened and improved for the Members of the Church of England, in their different ranks and stations, to express both sympathy and love to an established Protestant Church thus near to us, and in trials and difficulties which may very soon reach our own Church. O how blessed will trials be if they do but bring near to each other the faithful brethren of all the Churches of Christ!"

Now without further reference to the particular case of Mr. Campbell, in regard to which much difference of opinion exists, you will observe that Bickersteth distinctly gives it as his opinion, that the great principles and the grand aim for which the then Church of Scotland was contending, are "scripturally right and of immense importance."

The subjoined quotation from the same quarter, is rather long, but I cannot withhold it from you. "Let me, lastly, exhort all Christians now to COUNT THE COST OF BEING DECIDED FOR THE LORD; and to make up their minds to *count all things but loss*, and if need be, to *suffer the loss of all things, to win Christ and be found in him*. He must be a dull observer of the signs of the times, who does not discern that every thing is tending to bring out the reality and strength of men's principles, and to discriminate between *him that serveth God and him that*

~~serveth him not.~~ Whatever of past defects may have helped to occasion the present trying state of the Scotch National Church, (and none will be more ready to confess such than the most faithful of Christians in that Church) who can witness, without sympathy and admiration, love and prayer for them—I am sure I cannot—the firm standing on conscience and the devotedness to principle at great sacrifices, of the half of the National Clergy, many of them distinguished for zeal and piety. May God give them more and more the spirit of wisdom and truth, long-suffering and love! Who can look at this trial without seeing a loud call on us all, to examine our principles and the ground on which we stand, and whether we, at such cost, will be faithful to Christ. I doubt not that there will be an enlarged spiritual blessing to ministers and members of that Church in the whole course of this severe trial of their principles. God grant it abundantly!”

“We may see its beginning in the statements made by faithful ministers, who are compelled by their situations to take a public part in these trying times. Very striking are those which have been made by Dr. Candlish on more than one occasion. His sermon, December 18, 1842, addressed to students and young men, on 1. Thess. V. 21, is full of awakening thought. Well, does he observe, “men will draw off to their respective sides as the field is clearing for the combat, and they will shake themselves more and more free from all engagements and entanglements which might distract or disconcert them. The merely secular elements which have hitherto entered into the discussion or controversies of the Church, or of the world, will give place to what is spiritual, whether it be spiritual wickedness in high places, or spiritual faith and patience in those who wrestle against it.”

“Very beautiful also is his assured anticipation, the exigencies of the times will bring all who are like-minded closer together, and compel them better to understand one another. The perils of a common warfare, the pressure of a common persecution, the calls of a common duty to preach the word, to preach it freely, widely, everywhere, and at all seasons—as the only antidote to Antichristian poison, the only salt that can save the earth, and, ABOVE ALL, THE LONGINGS OF A COMMON HOPE, EVEN THE HOPE OF THE COMING OF THE LORD; for which the souls under the altar cry, *How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge thy saints?* these common ties will surely draw nearer to one another all who hold the head, which is Christ, and whom Antichrist would fain destroy!”

“The distinct separation from all merely political parties, and the distinct standing upon the word of Christ, are remarkable features of this movement, and we trust may continue to distinguish it from all mere worldly measures. Our strength is from above, and testimony to the truth, and sufferings for it, are our path till the return of our Lord. May his people be kept from leaning on any arm of flesh, and especially from all parties hostile to the government of our country!”

“Thus powerfully, also does Mr. Wallace, of Hawick, lay before his parishioners the character of the approaching conflict.”

“God appears to be preparing, by the solemn movements of his providence, for a process of the sternest sifting, when those of you who are Christians by mere profession, will probably be separated from those who are Christians in deed and in truth; and when the main controversy will be, not between one party and another, in regard to matters of secondary and subordinate importance, but between Christ on the one hand, and the world on the other. If we read the signs of the present time aright, that is the very trial that is drawing near to us all; and in the course of it, we doubt not, that the language of Daniel shall be strikingly fulfilled: *‘Many shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.’*”

“For such a trial there seems to be an urgent need. In this Christian land, and for a considerable time back, all classes of men have been very much mingled together. The broad and characteristic distinctions between the disciples of Christ and the men of the world have been, in a great measure, lost sight of. The enmity which God meant to be eternal and uncompromising between the seed of the woman and the serpent, has been permitted almost to die away. The world and the Church have joined hands together as if they were brethren, and the peace which the world loves has been the result. But God appears to be taking the matter into his own hands; and we understand nothing, either of the philosophy of history, or of the principles of the Bible, if his providential procedure at the present time, do not lead to this result,—that a line of broad and palpable distinction shall be drawn between the men of the world and those whose lives are hid with Christ in God. The judgment and the trial seem already to be beginning with the house of God, and with God’s ministers; and it is likely to be a strong sifting for us all, such a sifting as will put every thing like neutrality out of our power, either constraining us by the fear of man, which bringeth a snare, to make shipwreck of our faith, and to cast in our lot with the men of the world who have their portion only in this life; or impelling us, in the integrity of our spirits, and in the strength of firm, unshaken, and unalterable principle, to go beyond the camp, bearing Christ’s cross, and suffering its reproach.”

“Nor is it likely the trial will stop with us. In all likelihood it will also pass into the bosom of your families, and unto all of you whose hearts are right in the sight of God, and who are steadfast in Christ’s covenant, it need not be surprising though it should be felt, and felt with a bitterness not to be described, that *a man’s enemies shall be they of his own household.*”

The following remark from the same pen is very significant—“apart from the scriptural and ecclesiastical view of the subject, the legal difficulties are such in the present Scotch National Church dispute, that the ablest judges in Scotland have formed different judgments. It is however, striking to see that the most opposite merely political parties unite against the Church, which professes to stand simply on the Word of God. The subject deserves special attention as one of those

remarkable signs of the times, indicating coming events." Shall we follow the multitude, and take part with the world against those who are standing simply on the word of God?

You will, I am sure, excuse the length of these quotations. I have given them to you as the testimony of an impartial writer, of one whom you and I would desire to follow in many things, and whose example we should not reject without question or inquiry, when we find him sympathizing in spirit with the suffering members of the Kirk, and striving in prayer for them.

You think the seceders wrong in their separation from the Established Church, because "as you believe, there was no difference of opinion on any subject, which was considered necessary to salvation." I am free to admit, that a person in a justified state, does not fall from that state by adhering to the Moderates, or that one not justified is at once made a member of Christ's spiritual body by joining the Free Church. And yet I think that on further examination you will find the principles involved in this struggle to be of paramount interest, vital and essential in their character, and highly influential in their practical operation.

The Church has been put in trust with the Gospel. She is the salt of the earth to purify the mass of corruption which pollutes it; she is the light of the world to dispel the darkness which envelopes it. She has received this commission from her Supreme Head; and be assured He has not sent to her on this high and holy work without laying down certain fixed principles of government for her guidance and direction. The Bible is His statute-book, and we there find the grand principle of Christ's Supreme Headship over His Church distinctly asserted. It is a principle of direct and immediate application, affecting the Church in both its component parts, the laical and ecclesiastical bodies, rendering the ordinary members of the Church, responsible to the Head for the election and nomination of their pastor; and the office-bearers or ministers of the Church responsible to the same Head for the ordination of those who are to minister to the people. I will not enter more at length into this part of the subject, but again refer you to the publications which I have sent you, in which you will find the fullest and most satisfactory statements respecting the true character of this mighty principle, the manner of its operation, and the results to which it leads.

You cannot, I am sure, after perusing these publications, continue in your present belief that the struggle in the Scotch Church involved no essential point. If Christ has given laws for the Government of His Church are men at liberty to alter or abrogate them as they please? Has he done any thing without a cause. Does he not see the end from the beginning? Does he not know the most effective means for carrying on the work of redemption; and does man in his wisdom know better? Study well this principle in its tendencies, and you will see that it is of paramount importance. In the clearest manner it points out the duties, and declares the privileges of congregations and ministers. It shews how these duties are to be discharged, and

these privileges enjoyed by the respective parties in perfect harmony and with blessed results. A godly people (limited in number, for instance, to the communicants of a congregation) acting under a deep sense of their responsibility to their Head, will not have any but a godly pastor to take the oversight of them; a godly pastor will seek to edify the godly and to reclaim the ungodly; and thus by a course of healthy action and reaction this principle is eminently adapted to accomplish the ends contemplated by the economy of Redemption, in the promulgation of the Gospel and the salvation of souls.

But it is asked, was there sufficient ground for the separation from the Established Church? Have not the seceders been contending for a shadow? The question sounds strange to those who value the great principles involved in the struggle. The question at issue in its original form, was whether the Christian Members (only communicants) of a congregation should be permitted to refuse or decline the appointment amongst them of a worldly or unacceptable minister, presented to them, it may be by an ungodly patron, and whether they should be permitted to exercise this veto (as it has been termed) uncontrolled by any secular power, and subject only to the spiritual superintendence of their Presbytery. Now here was the least possible and the very humblest demand that a Christian people could make for their constitutional rights, and yet in it was involved the whole question, what is Christ's, what is Cæsar's? Whom shall we obey? Shall we favour the unfit minister and please Cæsar—or refuse him and serve Christ? Why here the whole principle was at stake, and what could be done by those who contended for its unalterable inviolability, but separate from the Church which would tolerate its violation? Recollect too that the first infraction of a principle is as the letting in of water: it does violence to its integrity and soon leads the way to greater aggressions. In the recent instance of the Church of Scotland, the Civil Courts commenced by upholding the patron in forcing a minister upon a reclaiming congregation, and concluded, in the language of the highest judicial authority, by not leaving to the Church one spiritual function with which those Courts had not interfered.

Let me tax your patience for a little while longer, while I crave your attention to the practical operation of the principle for which the Free Church of Scotland has been contending as exemplified in the Churches of England and Scotland, ere yet the separation in the latter had taken place. The Church of England is Erastian in its constitution, acknowledging the King as Supreme in all matters and causes ecclesiastical; while the Church of Scotland, ere its fall, acknowledged no other head in such matters than the Lord Jesus Christ. I think we may trace the operation and effects of these opposite principles in the condition and circumstances of the two Churches. And here do not condemn me for dwelling upon the faults of our own Church. Believe me those are not her best friends who would keep them from the light.

First as to the ministry. In the Church of Scotland, in its best days, the minister was virtually chosen by the Christian people and



ordained by the Presbytery. The patron might exercise his right of patronage, but not without reference to the recognized duties and privileges of the laical and ecclesiastical bodies. What has been the result? a body of ministers taken as a whole, the most scripturally pure in their doctrine, the most pious and godly in their lives, and the most devoted to their work.\* In the Church of England the Patron nominates and appoints the presentee to an incumbency without any reference whatever to the will of the people, and too often, alas! without any reference whatever to the qualifications of the nominee. Has the result been as satisfactory? God forbid that I should say one syllable in disparagement of the Evangelical Clergy of the Church of England. I do not believe there are to be found more devoted, pious and able ministers of the New Testament in any Protestant communion upon earth. Well may we bless God for our Noels, our Bickersteths, our Closes, and hundreds of their stamp. But take the entire body, and can you say as much for them as for the Clergy of the late Church of Scotland? Alas! many (it is said the majority) of them are abettors one of the foulest heresies that ever infested and corrupted the Church of Christ. As to other points, what say you to the following interrogatory put to his Diocesan the Bishop of London, by a Presbyter of the Anglican Church; the question perhaps might as well have been spared, but surely the very circumstance of there being any ground for the inference to be drawn from it is indicative of a melancholy state of things: "If every unconverted Clergyman in your Lordship's diocese, were put under arrest at eight o'clock on Sunday morning next, and kept in close confinement for twenty-four hours, how many of your Churches would be without divine service on that day?"

Then as to the people. The progress of vital religion is dependent upon the preaching of the word, and this again in its true scriptural sense, upon a Godly ministry. Under such a ministry as that with which Scotland has been blessed, we might expect to find religion making its way among the people. Nor shall we be disappointed. The preaching of the truth by a man of God, his pastoral supervision, and the Sabbath-school under his counsel and direction, have changed the religious and moral aspect of many a village in Scotland, until it

\* You will bear in mind that I speak of the Church of Scotland when in the exercise and enjoyment of those privileges, which are involved in the doctrine of the Headship of Christ, for which the Free Church has been contending, and for the maintenance of which it is now in separation from the National Establishment. While the Veto was in operation, under the Act of 1834, and before that, during the period that it was fully recognized through the force of public religious feeling, aye, and of nationally plighted faith, and the people exercised the privilege of opposing their Veto to the nomination of the Patron, the Church flourished. In the days of Moderatism, when there was no Veto, it was almost dead. It is interesting to study the History of the Church of Scotland, with reference to the operation of this grand principle of Christ's Ecclesiastical Headship over his Church. It is marked by energy and life, or by torpor and death, just as the principle was maintained in the days of Evangelical, or abandoned in those of Moderate ascendancy.

may, with truth, be said that as compared with the English the Scotch are an educated and religious people.

Lastly as to discipline. We have enough to shew us that the Church of Scotland would not tolerate for a day any approach to false doctrine in any of its ministers. The case of Mr. Campbell of Rowe is to the point. What shall we say of our poor Zion? The Lord does indeed seem to have a controversy with her. She is more than half way to Rome, and yet there is no one to arrest the soul-destroying heresy that is taking her there. Some there are who, in spite of past experience, are looking for help to the Bishops. But what can they do? What have they done? Influenced by secular interests, and restrained by secular power, they will not, cannot, dare not, put forth a hand to stay the evil. They may preach, and some of them have preached right well, against it; but what care the Jesuits and Heretics of Oxford for this preaching. Professing the most profound respect for Episcopal authority, they go on their course without let, or deviation to a hair's breadth, in spite of ten times repeated Episcopal denunciation. We have a notable instance of this close at home. No one of the Bishops has denounced the Oxford heresy more scripturally and powerfully than the Bishop of Calcutta; and yet is it not preached without disguise at no great distance from his palace? If the safety of the Anglican Church is to depend upon her Bishops, her days are numbered, and her doom is sealed.

Now I beg you to consider these points not merely as facts, but in connection with the differing principles which distinguish the Churches of which I have been speaking. Trace the working of the respective principles of both. The subject will bear examination. And if you find on the one hand that the Erastian principle of an earthly sovereign's headship over the Church, by which the King, through his delegates, may control almost every act and function of the ecclesiastical body, leaves the Church powerless as to the maintenance of any thing like discipline in spiritual matters; and if, under the operation of the same principle, you find a system in force, which tolerates the appointment to the Episcopal Bench of men, because they happen to be quondam tutors of members of Royalty or connections of Cabinet Ministers; which, in regard to those entering upon the ministry, permits the nomination and appointment of ministers without reference to the will of the Christian people, and often to the qualifications essential to the discharge of the ministerial office; and which (not to speak in stronger or more positive terms) is at least, calculated to lead to all the evils of an inefficient ministry and a neglected flock; and if on the other hand you find that the scriptural principle of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ, which imposes a direct responsibility both upon the ordinary and ministerial members of the Church, in regard to the selection and ordination of pastors to take the oversight of Christian congregations, has its results in the blessings of an efficient ministry and a religious people, say must we not consider the Headship of Christ as a doctrine of paramount importance, instead of (as too many are apt to consider it)

only a question of Church discipline or, an abstract, uninfluential, inoperative principle : and shall we any longer think those in error, who have sacrificed every thing the world can give, in order to maintain it in all its scriptural integrity?

Are you scared by the bugbear of ambitious priests grasping at power? for this is a charge which has been brought against the ministers who have seceded from the Scottish Establishment. I deny\*not that such things have been ; but what then? If a priesthood chosen and appointed in violation of the laws of Christ's Government, have grasped at power and abused it, is that a reason why a priesthood chosen and appointed in conformity to those laws should do the same? The case of the Church of Scotland should teach us otherwise ; for there we see a ministry refusing power when offered to it, and sacrificing all in contending, not for their own powers, but for the privileges of their people. Men do not make such sacrifices for mere abstractions ; they do not relinquish house and home in open confession of a principle which they secretly repudiate. Rest assured that those who make sacrifices in defences of right principles, are the most likely persons to carry them out into practice.

I have extended my letter to a greater length than I originally intended, and yet have left much unsaid. My object, however, has not been so much to discuss the great doctrine for which the Free Church of Scotland has made such noble sacrifices, as to induce you to consider it. Believe me it is not a merely local question, but one of vast and general importance to all Christian communities. As I before said, I believe the time is fast approaching when our own communion will be forced to give heed to it in a manner far more decided than obtains at present. The spectacle recently exhibited in Scotland, may be for judgment, or for mercy to the Church of England—for judgment if the warning be neglected, for mercy if it be rightly improved. The storm is gathering, and methinks the cloud on the horizon, charged rather with the lightning and the thunder than with genial showers, is even now somewhat larger than a man's hand : but if the signs of the times be improved, a gracious God may yet avert the threatened danger. In the mean time let us sympathize with those who have been the first in our day to contend, and to suffer, for maintaining intact, that which shall be the glory of the Millennial Reign, the Supreme Headship of the King of Zion. Let us take heed to ourselves how we refuse them, lest haply we be found to refuse Him who is with them.

That the Spirit of Truth may guide you into a right judgment in this matter, is the earnest prayer of,

Your's very sincerely,

J. H.

## III.—SIR GEORGE SINCLAIR AND THE DISRUPTION.

[In Sir George Sinclair's letter, as given below, we have a specimen of a phenomenon in the present day, nowise uncommon—disruption of Head and Heart.—Sir George's head is a (pro tempore) residuary, but his heart has gone out. No one can read his late productions, without seeing that his better-half is where it ought to be; and we should not wonder to see the other half soon follow, and so become better too. We ever have esteemed him as a good man; but we never could rely upon his wisdom:—he has of late been at fault—but, true to the truth, as we hope he is, he will soon recover the scent. The remarks of the "Guardian" we also subscribe—because they are calm, sober, pointed and just. May all our good men be brought back, and our bad men be made good! meanwhile, we shall make the unhappiness of our deserters a plea for faithfulness, and the struggles of the faint-hearted an argument for bold adherence. The whispers of truth within the heart of love, are louder than storms of error within the head of selfish worldliness.]

Thurso Castle, 28th August, 1843.

DEAR SIR,—I have already expressed my conviction that the bill, which has now received the Royal assent, could not, in its present shape, have proved satisfactory to the Convocationists. It may, perhaps, be asked, why I find fault with the Government for not having laid it on the table before the disruption took place? I answer, firstly, that a more ample and acceptable measure should, under the circumstances of the case, have been propounded; and secondly, that the production even of this bill would have been hailed as an indication, that the Government was really desirous to restore peace, and prevent schism—and it might (if time had been given) have been so modified, as to have enabled and induced all or most of the ministers who have left the Church to have, conscientiously and creditably, remained within its pale. You no doubt read the three letters, in which I so strenuously advocated the introduction of a bill prior to the meeting of the assembly. A similar course was recommended by a number of Conservative Scottish members, whom I had the honour to meet some weeks before the calamity took place; and so anxious were some excellent clerical friends of mine (who have not seceded) for the adoption of this course, that one of them expressed himself to the following effect, in a communication dated 6th April:—"Every day makes it more and more clear, that you and we were right in urging the Cabinet to bring forward their measure long ago. A schism is at length inevitable. The only question now is, as to the probable extent of it. That, I fear, will be much greater than many seem to imagine, in consequence of the course to which the Government appear determined to adhere. No one is disposed to make greater allowances for them than myself, in the difficult circumstances in which they have been placed, having to reconcile such conflicting views and interests, and having such different advice tendered to them from different quarters; but I say it in the bitterness of my heart, in my humble opinion, they could scarcely have acted differently from what they have done, had they intended—what it is unnecessary to tell you I am persuaded they never dreamt of for a moment—to ruin the Church of Scotland, and to destroy the usefulness of its ministers." I myself have all along been persuaded, that the unhappy distrust and suspicion, which subsisted between the Church and the Cabinet, and which I never could succeed in removing from the minds of either party, constituted the chief cause of the disruption. My last letter to Lord Aberdeen (implor-

ing immediate legislation) was wholly ineffectual; and when I returned to Edinburgh, a week before the meeting of Assembly, I submitted to Drs. Chalmers, Welsh, Candlish, and Cunningham, to the Rev. Mr. Bruce, to Mr. Young, and Mr. Moncrieff, a proposal that we should have a meeting, and make the bill, which I have printed in the appendix to my letter to Mr. Davidson, the subject of friendly conference; and if we could modify and alter it, so as to meet the views of the Church, without being rendered inadmissible on the part of the State, I would go back to London the same night, and submit it to Sir R. Peel, with a sanguine hope that he would be persuaded to introduce it at once, for the sake of averting so great an evil, as was otherwise inevitable—in which case, by returning without delay, I might arrive in time to intimate his assent to the proposal a few hours before the proceedings of the Assembly commenced. I was unsuccessful in my endeavours to persuade most of these eminent men to entertain this suggestion favourably; and nothing remained for me to do but to allow matters to take their course, and witness a consummation which I so sincerely deplored and deplored.

Another question has been addressed to me from various quarters. viz., why I have remained a member of the Establishment, when almost all the friends and all the ministers whom I most esteem and value have thought it their duty to leave it? To this I reply, that I have not joined the Free Church, because it appears to me that *both their principles and their practice necessarily lead to Voluntarism*—at least, they would do so in my own case; and I have been unable to convince myself that this country can dispense with the secular advantages belonging to an Establishment. I am therefore of opinion, that although the provisions of the new law are not sufficiently popular and comprehensive, it is, on the whole, more advisable to try how the Establishment principle can work under the present system, than at once to become the enemy of an institution which I have so long venerated and admired. I acknowledge as cheerfully as their most zealous adherents can do, the talents, piety, and disinterestedness of the excellent men who have left the Church. It seems to me, indeed, that they greatly contributed to bring about the lamentable schism which is now rending the peace and harmony of the whole of Scotland, propounding such views, and urging such pretensions, as I do not think any Government would have countenanced, or any Legislature have conceded, to their full extent; but still they are to be esteemed highly in love, and held in reputation, as faithful, sincere, accomplished, and devoted servants of the great Master, whose they are, and whom they serve.

Many politicians are buoying themselves up with the hope, that the Free Church will prove a very ephemeral institution, and that it will fall in pieces from two causes—1st, The appointment by the Crown and private patrons of efficient and pious successors where vacancies have been created by the recent resignations. I entertain, however, great doubts whether the hearers, who have deliberately and reluctantly made up their minds to quit the Church of their fathers, will so lightly transfer their confidence and affection from men whom they have long loved and habitually revered, and who have made a noble and entire sacrifice of their private interests, to new pastors, who come amongst them under circumstances of manifest disadvantage. But, 2d, it is confidently expected that, when the seceding ministers are removed by death from their respective spheres of usefulness, their congregations will at once return to the Establishment. My own opinion is directly the reverse. I believe that a number of able and devoted young men will be prepared for the holy office of the ministry, under the superintendence of the first divine of the age and his coadjutors, who will gradually take the place of the aged incumbents; so that, if adequate funds

are raised, the influence of the Free Church is much more likely to be increased than to be diminished. But I do not think that, with all their efforts, sufficient means will be collected for meeting the many demands which must be made from all quarters upon the resources of the Free Church; and this is, in my opinion, the only obstacle (but a very serious one) to its progress or to its stability. It does appear somewhat anomalous and inconsistent, to see the leaders of that institution soliciting the sympathies, and relying on the aid, of Voluntary Churchmen, whilst, in the same breath, they disclaim all confidence in the principle which their new allies regard as fundamental; and that, whilst professing their adherence to the Establishment principle, all institutions founded on that basis are denounced as objects of their implacable hostility. For my own part, I never pass a single day without lamenting the catastrophe which has taken place, and which has crippled to so fearful an extent the usefulness and respectability of the Established Church in the county from which I address you. As patron of this parish, it has been my endeavour, as well as my duty, to secure the ministrations of an incumbent, of whose efficiency and probity I have received most satisfactory attestations. He has rendered himself *prima facie* acceptable to such of the parishioners as have remained connected with the Establishment, amongst whom are included all the heritors (or their representatives) by whom the stipend is paid, and the fabrics of the church and manse upheld. I wish him all possible success, and shall show him all possible respect. But I cannot contemplate without "great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart" the deserted seat, in which the grey-headed elders were wont to meet, and the empty benches, so recently occupied by matrons and patriarchs, lowly (it may be) in station, but pre-eminently adorning the gospel by the piety and consistency of their life and conversation. The case will, I believe, be precisely similar in almost every parish throughout the county. "Arise, let us go hence," has been the all but universal exclamation, in regard to the Establishment, of thousands of her most devoted adherents, who, a few months ago, would not have counted their lives dear to them, had they been called upon, not to be bound only, but to die in defence of her rights and liberties. Where are they now? "Our fathers (in point of Christian worth had experience), where are they?" Still congregating their families to the morning and evening services, within the precincts of the same dwellings—still attending with, if possible, increased veneration, the weekly ministrations of the same pastors, though no longer within the walls of the same church—still cherishing the same bright hopes—still setting the same consistent example—still (as at this very season in this neighbourhood), assembling with more intense alacrity, and in still augmenting numbers, from the most distant parishes, to strengthen each other's hands, and encourage each other's hearts, by a united and fervent participation in the most solemn of our religious ordinances. O how dearly have the conquerors (if indeed they be conquerors) purchased their triumph! Had I been the most ardent friend of patronage (instead of regarding it, as I have never ceased to do, as the greatest blemish in our ecclesiastical polity), I would rather have sacrificed that principle, than (by adhering to it, and pertinaciously refusing such a modification or restraint upon its exercise as its most strenuous opponents were prepared, for the sake of peace, to have acquiesced in) have rent the Church in twain, and rendered it not only a duty on the part of many of its best and holiest members reluctantly to leave it, but a matter of extreme difficulty and painful conflict in the case of others (and myself amongst the rest), to remain within its pale, from a conscientious adherence to the Establishment principle, and a deliberate distrust in the efficiency of that very Voluntarism which has been so powerfully denounced by these eminent authorities, who are now entirely

dependent upon its resources for the maintenance and stability of their Church.

I ever remain, very truly yours,

GEORGE SINCLAIR.

A second letter from Sir George Sinclair which appears in to-day's paper, although it reiterates the statements of the former as to the ruin wrought on the Established Church, and bears witness even more feelingly to the powerful struggle, that it costs him to stay in, does yet prove that he is animated by sentiments the reverse of unfriendly to it. We cannot allow ourselves to doubt that Sir George's convictions will eventually issue in his separation from the dishonoured Church; but when that even takes place, it is evident it will be under the constraint of an absolute conscientious necessity. At present he cannot reconcile his mind to such a step.

Sir George cannot sufficiently deplore the insatiation of the Government, in not bringing in some bill or other, before the disruption actually took place. Of course, if the Government thought that they could produce any bill, that the Church could without dishonour accept of (and to offer it any other, implies the greatest discredit to themselves), they were bound, by every principle of duty, to lay it on the table, before the meeting of Assembly. But knowing, as we do, from their own repeated declarations, that they never meant to grant any measure, that would really save our principles, we cannot participate in his regret on this subject. If they had brought in, at the last moment, some unsound, but plausible and skilfully framed bill, no one can estimate the confusion they might, for a time, have created in our ranks. It would have been like the cruel offer of a free pardon to a martyr at the stake, on condition of signing some deceitful recantation. Without sufficient time to consider its provisions, many whose hearts were in the right place might have felt painfully undecided, and when their brethren proceeded to take the final step, in vindication of their principles, might either have lingered behind, or have advanced to the sacrifice of all things without a perfect conviction of its necessity. As it was, we cannot but think that it was a special kindness of Providence so to overrule the minds of Government, that seeing they were determined *not* to concede what the Church could conscientiously accept, they offered nothing at all till the irrevocable deed was done. Thus did the great Head of the Church make the path plain before his servants; and thus were they enabled, cheerfully and unhesitatingly, and in one firm and united band, to bear a testimony for the truth such as the world had never before seen.

We give Sir George full credit for the benevolence of his intentions, which induced him to try to bring about a meeting of the leaders of the Church the week before the sitting of the Assembly, in order to frame some new bill that might by possibility have received the sanction of the Government. At the same time we do not see how these distinguished men could, with any propriety, have given in to his proposal. The Claim of Rights embodied in it the very lowest settlement which the Church had solemnly declared it could accept of. After that claim had been emphatically and deliberately spurned away by her Majesty's Ministers, for the Church to have again forced that claim upon their attention, would obviously have been useless; and to have hinted at any lower settlement would, and justly, have drawn down upon her the scorn and contempt of her enemies. We cannot therefore blame the leaders of the Church for not acceding to his kind and well-intentioned proposal. If they had done so, they might have done much harm, but had no rational probability of doing any good. They had exhausted

every effort that a sincere desire for an honourable settlement could dictate ; but in vain We readily admit that "the distrust and suspicion" which the Church entertained of the Cabinet was very great ; but the question is, "Was it not well-founded ?" After "the surprise and alarm" which Sir George himself felt constrained to express in his letter to Lord Aberdeen, even before the disruption, when comparing the later statements of the Government with their previous ones, we think the question will at once be answered in our favour. The Marquis of Breadalbane was at the very time fully inclined to repose confidence in the intentions of the Government. But he, too, soon found that that confidence was misplaced.

It is matter of deep and especial regret with Sir George, that the Church had not taken up lower ground on the subject of spiritual jurisdiction. Our views on that subject, he thinks, were "such as no Government would have countenanced, and no Legislature would have conceded," to the extent we demanded. Now as to the Governments and Legislatures of the present day, made up as these are chiefly of Englishmen, we readily admit it. But it is a historical fact, which has been demonstrated again and again, and by few more ably than by the Marquis of Lorne, that the whole amount of jurisdiction which we claimed was ratified and confirmed by repeated acts of the Scottish Parliament, and finally embodied in the Treaty of Union, as a fundamental condition of it, to be observed "unalterably for ever." Nor was the act of Anne itself ever regarded, till *now*, as in any respect interfering with that jurisdiction. We know very well how hopeless is the effort to convince, by reasoning, of the propriety of such a jurisdiction, any one who, like, Sir George, has been educated in England, and, by his constant intercourse with Englishmen, has imperceptibly imbibed the favourite prejudices of a country, in which it is one of the first principles of constitutional law, that the civil magistrate is "supreme in *all* causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil." We live in the confident hope, that he will soon be brought practically to occupy the same position with ourselves. But that is a consummation which, we believe, will be brought about more by the development of the *results* of the two contrasted systems, now on their trial in Scotland, than by any elaborate argument. Like the Rev. Mr. Hiutz of Berlin, however much difficulty he may find in making up his *mind* to join us, we are sure he will find no difficulty ere long in making up his *heart* to do so.

In the meantime, however, it is not unworthy of his consideration, that however easily Sir Robert Peel and other English statesmen think they can demonstrate, on the principles of '*English jurisprudence*,' the absurdity of our claims, the most acute and learned of Scottish divines who have adhered to the Establishment, do not find it so easy a task to set aside the charge which we have brought against them, of consenting to the entire subversion of the spiritual liberties of the Church. The protest laid on the Assembly table on the day of the disruption, by a *clear majority of its legal members*, did, in the face of all Christendom, solemnly declare, that the Church, now by law established in Scotland, had apostatised from the grand doctrine that the Lord Jesus Christ is sole King and Head of his Church. This was a grave charge, and the Residuary Assembly felt that it was so. A Committee was therefore appointed to prepare an appropriate reply before the rising of the Assembly. The Committee met ; but they could not agree upon an answer. Three different answers were given in by three different members. The Assembly listened to each of them in succession, and found that not one of them was a safe or satisfactory answer to the protest. It therefore broke up without answering the protest ; and an adequate answer was ordered to be prepared against the meeting of commission. The meeting of the Commission came, and Mr. David Milne was ready with an answer to lay before it ; but when the time to consider it



came, behold there was not a quorum. The Commission therefore had to break up as the Assembly had done, without rolling off the reproach, that lay upon it; and the Protest is to this hour unanswered. Now, is not this, to say the very least of it, suspicious? Does it not afford a strong presumption that they feel the inherent weakness of their cause, and that they dare not fairly look the matter in the face. If they could, they would certainly never have allowed themselves so long to be branded as an apostate Church that had abjured the sole headship of Christ. A fact like this will weigh not a little *prima facie*, with every candid mind.

But it is not merely, as a Scottish question, against which our legislators have English prejudices, that it has no chance of fair play. It is, as a spiritual question, pronounced upon by men who, in an overwhelming proportion, have no sense of vital religion, that the greatest antipathy is felt and expressed against it. We readily admit, that the doctrine of the exclusive spiritual jurisdiction of the Church, flowing from the sole headship of Christ, is a doctrine which was not likely to receive any countenance from governments or legislatures, as governments or legislatures are now constituted. But is that any argument against its truth, or any reason why we should think of paring it down? We are very certain that if Sir George were to take the opinion of the British Parliament on the question of justification by faith alone, he would find that it would get to the full, as little countenance in that quarter, as the doctrine we are now maintaining. The doctrines of grace would as certainly and as generally be stigmatised as subversive of sound morality, as the doctrine flowing from Christ's headship is pronounced to be subversive of all good government.

We have left ourselves little space to allude to the main reason which deters Sir George from quitting the Establishment, although "almost all the friends, and all the ministers he most esteems and values, have thought it their duty to leave it." That reason is, because he thinks that "both the principles and the practice of the Free Church necessarily lead to Voluntarism." From all apprehensions arising from this cause we doubt not he will easily be delivered. We hold now precisely the same principles on Church Establishments that we did in the very heat of the Voluntary warfare. We always maintained then, as we do now, that the Church could not barter away any of her inherent liberties for endowments—that the Church, if established, must yet be free—and that, if her establishment interfered with her freedom, then she must *not* be established. Sir George, we think, will readily admit that his late distinguished friend Dr. Mc'Crie, was an enlightened as well as an ardent friend of Establishments, yet these were the precise views which he entertained. Why, then, should he fear, when the Established Church of this country is upheld on terms that all consistent champions of national religion have ever denounced, that his following the example of the learned Doctor, and quitting a vitiated Establishment, should be in any danger of landing him in Voluntarism? So far from there being any danger of that, we hold that the day that witnessed the departure of so many men of God from St. Andrew's Church—leaving their all behind them, and bearing a full testimony for Christ as at once King of nations, and King of saints—secured the eventual triumph of the Establishment principle, and spiritual freedom along with it. Some may think that we are fairly beaten. And it is true that in a sense we have been defeated. But it has happened before now, that the fallen have been the conquerors. When Leonidas and his 300 Spartans were cut to pieces in the pass of Thermopylæ, the last of that noble band, on receiving his death-wound, wrote on his shield with the point of his sword, "I have conquered"—and expired. And this was no vain-glorious boast of the dying warrior. The liberties of Greece were secured by the valour of the slain; and Xerxes found he had only gained a

loss. So is it with the 470. They have been compelled to give way ; they have been compelled to leave houses and lands for conscience sake ? they have felt constrained to quit the pleasant places of the Establishment. But their principles have triumphed. The true scriptural principles of national Christianity have been exalted to a height in the eyes of the Christian world which they have never occupied before ; and when at last the heaven shall ring with the glad shout, " The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ," the memory of these noble confessors will be held in affectionate remembrance, as having aided as powerful instruments in speeding on such a glorious consummation.

With such men, a heart like that of Sir George Sinclair's must sympathise, whether he will or no. The tribute which he pays to the worth of the humble laity who have followed them out of the Establishment in Caithness, with which we close this article, is one of the most beautiful we have ever met with ; and hard-hearted must he be, whatever his views on the present controversy, who can read it unmoved :—

" As patron of this parish, it has been my endeavour, as well as my duty, to secure the ministrations of an incumbent, of whose efficiency and probity I have received most satisfactory attestations. I wish him all possible success, and shall show him all possible respect. But I cannot contemplate, without 'great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart,' the deserted seat, in which the grey-headed elders were wont to meet, and the empty benches, so recently occupied by matrons and patriarchs, lowly (it may be) in station, but pre-eminently adorning the gospel, by the piety and consistency of their life and conversation. The case will, I believe, be precisely similar in almost every parish throughout the country. 'Arise, let us go hence,' has been the all but universal exclamation, in regard to the Establishment, of thousands of her most devoted adherents, who, a few months ago, would not have counted their lives dear to them, had they been called upon, not to be bound only, but to die in defence of her rights and liberties. Where are they now ? 'Our fathers (in point of Christian worth and experience), where are they ?' Still congregating their families to the morning and evening services, within the precincts of the same dwellings—still attending with, if possible, increased veneration, the weekly ministrations of the same pastors, though no longer within the walls of the same church—still cherishing the same bright hopes—still setting the same consistent example—still (as at this very season, in this very neighbourhood) assembling with more intense alacrity, and in still augmenting numbers, from the most distant parishes, to strengthen each other's hands, and encourage each other's hearts, by a united and fervent participation in the most solemn of our religious ordinances. O how dearly have the conquerors (if indeed they be conquerors) purchased their triumph !" —*Scottish Guardian*.

## IV.—THE HOME MAIL.

[It is difficult to make a selection out of the mass of Intelligence which the *Home Mail* of September has brought us :—but we shall do our best to furnish our readers with such extracts as may enable them to form for themselves, a correct estimate of the real state of things, as regards the Free Church's cause in our own land, and chiefly from the "*Witness*" Newspaper.]

## 1.—FREE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

The first matter of importance under this head is the proposed Meeting of the General Assembly of the Free Protestant Church of Scotland, to be held at Glasgow on the 17th day of last October, and concerning whose most important proceedings, intelligence may be expected by the November Mail.

## (1.)—MEETING OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Our readers will remember that the next General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland is appointed to be held at Glasgow on Tuesday the 17th October. The Special Commission were empowered to make the necessary arrangements, and at the meeting of the Acting Committee on Tuesday last, they passed the following resolutions :—

"It having been appointed by last Assembly, that the General Assembly to be held at Glasgow on the 17th of October next ensuing, shall consist of all adhering Ministers and Professors of Divinity, with an elder from each Kirk-Session in connection with the Free Church; and it being remitted to the Special Commission to make arrangements in reference to the meeting of said Assembly, the Acting Committee do now, and with a view of carrying out the Assembly's instructions, resolve,—

"1. That a communication be addressed to the several Presbyteries of this Church, requesting that, at their meeting, which shall next precede the 5th day of October, they shall cause to be made up a roll of all the ministers and Professors of Divinity, members of their respective Presbyteries; and that the said roll, after being attested by their moderator or clerk, shall be immediately transmitted to the clerks of the Assembly. In the event of there being no meeting of Presbytery previous to the said 5th of October next, the moderator of Presbytery shall be requested to call a *pro re nata* meeting, for the purpose of making up, attesting, and transmitting the said roll of ministers and Professors of Divinity.

"2. That a communication be also addressed to the several Kirk-Sessions connected with the Church, requesting them to meet on some day between the 20th of September and 5th of October next, for the purpose of electing an elder to represent them in the ensuing General Assembly, due notice of said meeting, and the object thereof, to be made from the pulpit, or by circular letters to the members of Session.

"3. That a form of commission be at the same time sent down to each Kirk-Session, which having been filled up, shall be attested by the moderator or clerk, and thereafter transmitted without delay to the clerks of Assembly.

"4. That it be intimated to Kirk-Sessions, that, while it is most desirable that they return a representative of their own number, and that while this should in ordinary circumstances be considered as the rule, they shall, in consideration of the great importance of a full representation in this Assembly, and the difficulty of procuring the attendance of elders from Sessions in distant parts of the country, be at liberty to elect any elder belonging to the Free Church of Scotland, provided they be satisfied that he is a *bona fide* acting elder, and in every respect duly qualified.

"5. That the clerks of Assembly be requested to prepare a form of commission for representative elders, and to communicate with Presbyteries and Kirk-Sessions in reference to the foregoing resolutions."

6. That the following Committee be appointed to make such arrangements connected with the place of meeting, and otherwise, as may appear to be necessary for the despatch of business, and the comfort of the Assembly during its sittings in Glasgow, viz.—Rev. Dr. Buchanan, Rev. Mr. Lorimer, Rev. Mr. Jaffray, Henry Dunlop, Esq., Alex. Dunlop, Esq., Wm. Collins, Esq., Wm. Buchanan, Esq., and the Clerks of Assembly; Henry Dunlop, Esq., Convener.

The clerks of Assembly have accordingly transmitted a copy of the first five resolutions to the Moderators of the several Presbyteries, with a request that their roll of ministers be sent to the clerks as soon as made up. A copy of the resolutions has also been sent to every Kirk-Session, calling their attention to the 2d, 3d, and 4th of the above, with a form of the commission for their representative elder. We have to solicit the special attention of the Moderators of the several Presbyteries and Sessions to this matter; and should any of the circulars not have come to hand, intimation to this effect should be immediately given to the clerks of Assembly.

#### ELDERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

We lately inserted the Minute of the Special Commission relative to the election of elders to the ensuing Assembly. The election is to take place on a day between the 20th of this month and the 5th of October, which is to-morrow se'nnight. The *form* of a commission was prepared by the Clerks, and transmitted by them to every Kirk-Session, and several returns have already been made; but as the specified time is drawing near a close, we beg again to call the attention of our friends, members of Session, to the necessity of their electing without a day's delay. With many the *form* has been taken for a *schedule*, and the printed document returned with the elder's name merely filled in. This is a mistake, and should be avoided. The *form* was sent down to Sessions to be retained by them, and used for the present and any future election. It has the appearance as if the Session-clerks were too indifferent to copy the commission. As it has been sometimes asked for, we subjoin it:—

"At ———, the — day of —, 1843.

"The which day the Kirk-Session in connection with the congregation of the Free Church at ——— met, pursuant to notice duly given, for the purpose of electing an elder to represent them at the ensuing meeting of the General Assembly; and being constituted, did, and hereby do, nominate and appoint Mr. \* ——— to be their representative to the General Assembly

---

\* Here the elder's *designation* should be inserted as well as his *name*; not simply "A. B.," but "A. B., merchant in C." This error should be particularly avoided, that the labour of the clerks may not be increased.

of the Free Church of Scotland, indicted to meet at Glasgow on the 17th day of October next, willing him to repair timeously thereto, attend the several diets thereof, and to consult, vote, and determine in all matters that shall come before the said Assembly, to the glory of God and the good of His Church, according to the Word of God, the Confession of Faith, and Acts and Constitution of this Church; and that he report his diligence therein at his return therefrom. And it is hereby certified, that the said Mr. ——— is a *bona fide* acting elder, and in all respects duly qualified.

Attested by ———, Moderator.  
or  
————, Clerk.

#### THE GLASGOW ASSEMBLY.—MINOR ARRANGEMENTS.

We are not aware what definite arrangements have been made for the private accommodation of the representatives of the approaching Assembly during their ten days' stay at Glasgow. Are they when there, not on their own business, but that of the whole Church, to be required to stay at inns, and thus to spend very considerable sums of money which many of them can very ill afford? Besides, owing to the multitudes who will flock to Glasgow during that period, such accommodation will be then unusually difficult to be had, and probably unusually expensive. We are quite convinced that there are more than enough of zealous friends of our cause in the western metropolis, who would reckon it an honour to have in their houses during the sittings of the Assembly, a minister or elder of the Free Church. The whole might thus be comfortably accommodated to the mutual advantage of host and guest; and considering that Glasgow has not been thus privileged to "entertain strangers" since the days of Alexander Henderson, and that in Edinburgh the thing is now regularly done, we are sure the matter only requires to be suggested and practically arranged.

Suppose that 600 deputies repair to Glasgow on the 17th of October,—and this is beneath the probable number,—and that these men are forced to spend at an average, besides their travelling expenses, £5 each at an inn, here is £3000, under this head alone, entailed on men, most of whom have lately abandoned their worldly all. If Assemblies are afterwards to be held in Dundee, Perth, and Aberdeen, the same thing may be said of them. It is astonishing how slow many people,—otherwise intelligent,—are in making the practical applications of such obvious facts and considerations as these. Their ideas run on obstinately in the old channels, even after a revolution has taken place which has arrested the whole world. In England, amidst the masses of wealthy Dissenters, the whole subject is well understood. When meetings are to be held in any town, Christian friends vie with each other for the honour of having the ministers to reside at their houses during their residence there; and thus a most delightful spirit of brotherly love is cherished. This seems also to have been the apostolic practice, and hence the many allusions to it in the inspired epistles. It cannot be too soon made universal in Scotland. We say universal, for in Edinburgh it has long since been commenced, and is now carried on from time to time with great vigour and the best mutual results.

We advise, therefore, such friends of our cause in Glasgow as have a spare apartment, and are willing to have it occupied by a minister or elder, during the sittings of the approaching Assembly, immediately to intimate the same to the Committee at Glasgow having charge of the necessary arrangements. If there is any particular minister with whom they are acquainted, or whom they would specially desire as a guest, they may write to him personally.

And we trust that the local Committee for arrangements will not reckon their task more than half done, until they have put it in the power of every representative of the approaching Assembly to live comfortably, if he pleases, at a private house during all its sittings.

## (2).—FREE CHURCH PROGRESS.

### PROGRESS.

The enemies of the Free Church are beginning to rejoice, as if its days were numbered. "The misguided ministers will be starved," says one, half in sorrow, half in gladness, "the sustentation exchequer is so low." "Give them sites, give them assistance, give them anything," says another, very much in the spirit of a physician who allows a dying patient the use of anything which his caprice may choose, because his case is hopeless. "In two years the whole scheme will be exploded," says a third; "it will end, like all excitement, in exhaustion and collapse." And these opinions are industriously upheld by hostile parties, who ought to know that the statements which they vend are untrue. Dr. Chalmers had stated that *in a year* from the first Free Assembly, that is, in May 1844, a sum of "towards £300,000" would be contributed by the people of Scotland, *if the present rate of collecting be continued*. But our opponents, *leaving out the element of time*, wax now merry, and anon triumphant, because we have not, in less than four months, realized what we expected only in twelve. Their principles and their calculations are equally fallacious. They would rejoice with all their heart did the Free Church break down; and the wish is the father to the thought.

But the truth is, that our scheme has more than prospered,—the calculations of Dr. Chalmers have been realized. Already, for different purposes, a sum of towards £100,000 has been contributed; and £100,000 in less than four months, *"if the present rate of collecting be continued,"* would yield the full sum which the Church's financier anticipated for the twelve. If the church-door collections over Scotland were counted,—if the sums contributed to the Jewish and Education Schemes be kept in view—if the expenses of leading and labour given to the erection of new churches, where the people are too poor to give money, were all summed up,—it would be found that, instead of falling short, the total would surpass the expectations of the Church's most zealous friends. It is true, that at present, such is the press for erecting churches, that the people are concentrating their attention mainly upon that object, so that their funds never find their way directly to the central treasury. This is made abundantly plain by the state of church building over the country. Wherever one travels, one finds a church reared, or in course of erection, insomuch that one is astonished by their progress. We lately gave an instance of this, in reference to the south: take another in reference to the north; and starting, for example, at Auchtermarder, we find a Free Church there all but ready for the minister so harmoniously called; then at Dunning, a few miles distant, though the minister is a keen opponent, a Free Church minister has been called; then at Forgandenny another church is in progress; then at Bridge of Earn another; then at Abernethy, then at Newburgh, then at Auchtermuchty, then at Falkland; each being from the other not more than seven or eight miles distant. Scotland is thus being beautified all over by these fabrics,—monuments at once of the people's zeal, and of the blindness or infatuation

of our rulers. And all this in the short space of less than four months,—all this in spite of rancorous opposition, amounting, in some cases, to something like persecution,—all this in spite of gross misrepresentation,—all this in spite of the taunts of our adversaries, that our cause is befriended only by the poor, and that even among them it is not popular,—and all this not merely in one section of the country, but north, south, east, and west, wherever we can journey. Sir James Graham promises to bolster up the Establishment by a bill for the formation and endowment of new parishes. With all the appliances of Government protection and public money, will the Residuary build as many new Churches in four years, as the friends of the Free Church have reared in less than four months! Supposing that there are only 500 churches in course of erection,—though, we believe, there are more,—and estimating them, on an average, at only £400 for each, these Churches alone are to cost the people of Scotland £200,000; and yet there are men so bitterly opposed as to state, and others so warped by prejudice as to believe, that the friends of the Free Church have been disappointed in their calculations. We repeat, their anticipations have been more than realized, while the difficulties which confessedly still lie before them, ORIGINATE IN THE SUCCESS OF THEIR SCHEME. Had their attention been confined to the four hundred and fifty parishes whose ministers have abandoned the Established Church, the coming Assembly would have had little else than congratulations to record. As it is, the national extent, the magnificence of the scheme, comprehending, as we believe it does, at least one hundred churches in Moderate parishes, in addition to all the others, is the real cause and origin of its difficulties. The worst, however, is past. Hostility in some places begins to be mollified. We know some cases in which opposing farmers have begun to lend their horses and carriages to poor men, for Free Church work. We know one case in which a hostile proprietor, who refused an inch of ground for a site for the Church, was so influenced by the number of adherents, as to send for the minister, and ask him to choose his own site for a manse. "If a man's ways please the Lord, he will make even his enemies to be at peace with him." The people of Scotland have only to hold by their principles, and go honestly forward. It is not in the nature of things that the Residuary can prosper, just as it is not in the nature of things for a dead body to thrive and live. The Government may try a galvanising experiment upon it; but Dr. McCulloch will teach them the result. The only way to prevent it from being utterly swept away, is to do what the Government have declined,—to let the popular voice be heard in its proper place, and with the proper power. Destitute of that, it contains within itself the elements of decay. Externally it may be propped and underpinned,—internally it is an anomaly among our institutions; and nothing but indifference regarding it can long preserve it in being.

---

It is well known that Dumfries-shire is one of the most intensely Moderate districts in Scotland,—it holds that bad pre-eminence in the south which Aberdeenshire holds in the north. Men are there to be found of the genuine old school type, unmodified in principle or practice since the days of anti-missionary debates in the General Assembly, and the putting down of Sabbath schools as nurseries of sedition.

We lately spent a Sabbath in that district, and worshipped in two of its Free Churches,—that is, twice in the open air,—and cannot soon forget the doings of the day. During the previous night a thunder storm had raged in the valleys of the Dryfe and the Annan. As the Sabbath morning dawned the rain fell heavily, but the thunder died away, and as the day advanced,

the sun shone brightly out to gladden the homes of thousands. As we gazed on the quiet beauty of the scene, before the hour of worship, the most attractive of all its features were two Free Churches, about four miles apart, fast advancing to completeness, yet, too slowly for the zeal of the adherents. In the broad open valley the two rivers were fast finding their way to the Solway; in the distance, on the one side, an ancient burgh, long famed for its Moderatism, which is now said to be dying of inanition, shut up the view; on the other, Skiddaw was seen reposing amid the vapours gathered round its base; and altogether the scene was one which forcibly suggested the thought—if the earth, after the curse which clothed it with thorns and thistles, be so exceeding fair, what must its beauty have been when God pronounced it good!

As the hour of worship approached, grotpes of worshippers began slowly to move toward the village, as on communion days in the west and north of Scotland; and, strange to say, the equipage of affluence, as well as humbler conveyances, and hundreds a-foot, were moving forward to the common centre. The manse, half desolate, with its walks and flower-borders already covered with weeds,—its shrubberies tangled, and hastening to become a thicket,—an emblem of the spiritual desolation which many would spread,—gave a melancholy character to the whole. As it peeped out from its screen of venerable trees, it seemed to speak of unresisted oppression, and calmly to remind us that the sin of those who drove its happy occupants from that quiet home for conscience' sake will yet find its authors out. It is near spots like this, hallowed by the associations of three hundred years, that we feel most deeply impressed with the conviction, that the measures which have violated the constitution are also endangering the existence of the Established Church.

The place of worship was unique. It consisted of two courts attached to two contiguous cottages. The courts were divided from each other by a green hedgerow, at one end of which placed the tent. The aged and the sickly found a screen beneath the hedge, or in the outhouses which flanked the inclosures, and thus did six or seven hundred people assemble to worship God, because they could not homologate the principles of the Establishment by worshipping in the adjoining church. As they crowded into the inclosures, there sat on many a countenance an air of thoughtful anxiety, such as men exhibit when conscious of being wronged, and yet uncertain to what these things may grow,—whether they are yet to gather deeper blackness, like the past night's thunderstorm, or clear away into sunshine, like the Sabbath that shone on them. In this parish the minister has abandoned the Residuary; and the result here, as elsewhere in the neighbourhood, has been, that nearly four out of every five have abandoned it with him.

The other church in which we worshipped was about four miles to the south of the former, in a holm on the banks of the Milk, lonely and sequestered as befitted the occasion. Here, as before, the people assembled in hundreds, though the parish minister had commenced an extraordinary and a rival service in the parish church. His new-born zeal seemed equally to amuse and astonish the neighbourhood, and the comparative attendance was a tolerably accurate index of the state of men's minds in the district. The proportion might be as four or five to one.

When we thought that scenes like these were to be witnessed in four or five hundred districts in Scotland, we could not but marvel at the doings of Him whose ways are a great deep. A few months ago, what would not have been given by some to secure an adjustment of the Church question, and an end of our strifes! The union, however, of Moderate and Evangelical ministers was as incompatible as that of oil and water, and God has compelled a separation. The effects are beginning to be seen. Principle in



abstraction is an evanescent thing. Principle embodied in an action is intelligible to all; and no conviction relating to the future can be more deeply rooted in our mind, than that, *if the Free Church of Scotland had ministers at her command, she could have a congregation in every seven miles of Lowland country, within a year of the disruption.*

Even in the very Moderate districts we refer to, the progress of the Free Church is amazing. Starting, for instance, at Lockerbie, about seventy miles from the capital, we find there a Free Church about half erected, to accommodate that parish, and sections of those adjoining. About nine miles from Lockerbie, or Dryfesdale, we find the people at Wamphray,—the parish of the godly John Brown,—arranging with the adherents in Johnstone for the erection of a church to accommodate both, for the population of the one parish is only 509, of the other 1072. About four miles from Lockerbie, but not in the line of the high way, is Lochmaben, where a Free Church is nearly ready to be roofed in to accommodate that burgh, and contiguous portions of the adjoining parishes. Proceeding along the highway from Wamphray to Moffat, a distance of six miles and a half, we find a church nearly erected, and a minister already settled there, accommodating the adherents in that parish, and the small parish of Kirkpatrick-Juxta. From Moffat through Tweedsmuir, we find a blank of perhaps twenty miles, owing to the scattered nature of the population of that parish, amounting to only 276; but at Broughton we find a church nearly ready to be roofed in, to accommodate the adherents in that parish, with the upland districts of Drummelzier and Stobo. At a moderate distance to the west lies the parish of Skirling, where the new church will receive the population nearly to a map. At Kirkurd, in the line of the highway, a few miles from Broughton, the Free Church is far advanced towards completion. Then at Penicuik, we find a Free Church minister already placed; and, after many difficulties, arrangements for a church completed. A little to the right, Roslin Free Church is in progress. As we enter the city, Liberton Free Church is one of the first sights that greet us. And thus along a line of about seventy miles, we count nine churches nearly reared, and one at Wamphray on the eve of being so; and all this within three months and ten days of the disruption! Again, we say, principle embodied in action all can understand, and the people of Scotland have now demonstrated their fidelity to the Church of their fathers. We are far from supposing that our difficulties have been mastered; nay, the worst are yet to be encountered; and unless the friends of our cause bestir themselves, our troubles may speedily thicken. Reasoning, however, from the past to the future, we cherish the perfect confidence, that the hopes of our enemies will prove like those of the men of Nehemiah's time (iv. 3-6.)

---

#### SUBTERFUGES.

In any case but those in which conscience, and therefore the soul, is concerned, it would be amusing to notice the pretexts which are sometimes put forth for adhering to the Establishment. Some of these are simply ridiculous,—others are Jesuitical,—others so hollow that their own authors can scarcely believe them. Of the first class,—the ludicrous,—we may mention the following:—One of the men who so conveniently acquired new views on non-intrusion and spiritual independence just before the 18th of May, when asked why he had continued in the Church now guided by principles which he formerly repudiated, replied, that he “could not be fashed flittin.” Another stated, that he “could not think of leaving his own and his father's pulpit to a Moderate;” and, to prevent that, became worse than a Moderate himself. Another who used to annoy even Non-Intrusionists by the ultraism

of his views, deliberately stated that he meant to "keep his principles, and *only change his practice.*" It is truly sickening to think of such exhibitions. For men who have been in Strathbogie in defiance of interdicts, calmly to avow such maxims, indicates a proficiency and an opportuneness in *unlearning*, which posterity will characterise. It already begins to be estimated aright; and an act of public justice was lately done to it in the Town Council of Edinburgh.

But the most prevalent pretext for abandoning what was long held as a principle, just at the moment when it became dangerous to hold it, is the following: "We will not incur the risk of bringing down the Establishment." We know men who have travelled far and near to tamper with the consciences of ministers after they had sopited their own by that pretext,— "we will not incur the risk of bringing down the Establishment." But translate this into its proper meaning, and then see how hollow a thing it is;—can any man that does not wish to be deceived, be deceived by it! "No matter,"—this subterfuge implies,— "no matter though the Establishment be bereft of the principles which we hold essential to its well-being, we will not incur the risk of bringing it down. No matter though the people be deprived of their rights, and Christ's ministers of theirs,—the very principles for which we ourselves once lustily contended,—we will not incur the risk of bringing down the Establishment! No matter though there be not a single Presbytery in the Established Church of Scotland that dare take the Word of God for their guide in settling ministers, we will not incur the risk of bringing down the Establishment! No matter though the moderating in of calls, and the subscribing of the same, be but a solemn farce under the cloak of a religious ordinance, we will not incur the risk of bringing down the Establishment! We think this a right course for us to follow, and we will try to persuade others to do the same. Our people may abandon us when they see us abandoning our former principles, so that the Establishment will be left with only a handful of adherents; but we will not incur the risk of bringing it down!" Now, who does not see through this transparency! Had men honestly declared,—I am too proud to descend to a Seceder's position,—or, I have too little faith to venture on the waves at Cicer's invitation,—or, I now think that non-intrusion and spiritual independence ought to be abjured,—or, Moderatism is a good and commendable thing,—or, my income is of great importance in my view,—these would have been honest, straightforward, and manly. But the pretext of holding certain principles, and at the same time abiding by the Establishment, is so thin, and so easily seen through, that surely all but the men who wish to be deceived, or who are the dupes of their own designs, must see through it. Sir George Sinclair candidly confesses that it was "a matter of extreme difficulty and painful conflict," in his case, "to remain within the pale" of the Establishment. How strange that so many ministers so easily surmounted that difficulty, and so speedily became zealous partizans for not bringing down the Establishment after it was bereft of all which could render an Establishment, by their own former showing, worth upholding! "There are causes," said Lord Lorne, "I much fear, in which some portion of the people may be unwilling to attend the ministrations of a minister, from a loss of respect towards him, because he has exposed himself to charges of weakness and inconsistency, by his having shrunk from consequences which, in the opinion of the people, he ought in principle to have met." This has been already realised, and many more will bitterly feel it. "I may say I am a *peopleless minister*," was the sore confession of one of the Forty, writing to a friend; and the confession, we cannot doubt, will yet be made by others placed in similar circumstances, if indeed and in truth they be the children of God. He will not leave *his own* without correction.

"Let us remain in the Church, and continue to protest and struggle there." That is another common pretext; but wherever men have learned to think without bias, the subterfuge is seen through. For, protest against what? The very constitution of the Church to which you adhere. Not against abuses unconstitutionally or corruptly introduced, but against the avowed principles and maxims of the legal establishers of your Church. The charge of rebellion was once brought against you unjustly. You then defended the outraged Constitution,—you are now assailing *the actual and enacted* principles of that power in virtue of which you hold your presentations and eat your bread, so that the charge of rebellion, if now advanced, would be true. At every step you are liable to be checked by our masters, the Civil Courts; and, like one who is at this moment a member of your body, you must either change your principles or change your practice. If the former, then declare it; if the latter, then declare that. Give the people, in any one case, the position for which you *once* contended, and that instant you are checkmated by civil consequences. *You must either intrude or secede.* The casuistry by which you seek to justify your wheel, may satisfy yourselves; the people of Scotland in one sense cannot understand it,—in another they can.

#### STATE OF FEELING IN THE COUNTRY.

(From the "John Knox.")

In a pretty extensive excursion through the surrounding country, we have had occasion to converse with the inmates of the accommodation-manse and the humble cottage, and we wish to give a brief account of things as we found them. In the former, it was cheering to find not only contentment, but even cheerfulness, springing from high-toned principle and the confidence that the truth inspires. We could not help thinking with contempt of those unfeeling exhortations that men, devoid of the valour, because ignorant of the faith of true Christianity, addressed to the ministers of gospel, to sacrifice their principles to the tears of their wives and the comfort of their children, when we heard a minister's wife, with what of the furniture of the manse was barely necessary around her in her limited accommodation, express her conviction, that the disruption with the benefits that would flow from it to the cause of vital godliness, was preferable to a settlement of the question even on our own terms. Our statesmen, and the writers of such exhortations, would have done well to have informed themselves of the existence and strength of such sentiments, before they acted upon the supposition that there was no dread that ministers would allow their principles to interfere with their worldly comforts. The noble result has shown the unsoundness of their foundation.

In Moderate parishes, the effects of the agitation have been extraordinary. Fully to understand this, it would be necessary to know the state in which the people were as to spiritual things previous to the contest for the rights of the Church. In a word, we may venture to say, that many were in a deep mental lethargy, going through the dull formality of the prescribed round of duties of public religion, in which they felt no interest, but, on the contrary, a repulsive weariness. Instead of seeing ministers acting upon the Apostle's determination of knowing nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified, they heard moral essays or historical disquisitions, in which the name of Jesus was not once mentioned. No sooner had the benediction been pronounced, than the public crier was heard at the church door announcing various rousps that were to take place in the course of the week,—a practice which could not fail to form a worldly channel for the current of conversation on the way

home—a practice which, from the opposition of the lairds, some kirk-sessions endeavoured in vain to suppress. But now the gospel has been extensively preached and heard with the deepest interest. The truth has commended itself to the hearts of many; they have been awakened and led to inquire: and we will fearlessly venture to assert that the Bible, the Confession of Faith, the Scots Worthies, and the History of the Church, have been more extensively read and studied during the last *five* years than during the preceding *fifty*. And what has been the result? Let the formation of Church Associations, the termly collections for the sustentation of gospel ministry, and the universal activity in the erection of churches, return their expressive answer. At a pecuniary sacrifice, and the hazard of the displeasure of lairds and masters, tenants and servants are forsaking the Residuary and joining the Free. There is an air of calm determination about them, and their conversation is so far characterised by seriousness, that once and again, when walking in company with them, we have inferred, from the casual remarks of an acquaintance whom they met, “that is not a ‘Free’ man,” and found our conjecture correct. It would be worthy my Lord Aberdeen’s pains to make a tour, in company with some of his coadjutors, throughout the country from which he derives his title, and take, on Sabbath, a look upon the open air or barn congregations, and then contrast them with those of the State Church, and thus he would obtain a much more correct indication of the strength of non-intrusion in the hearts of the people, than if it had been rudely shouted in his ears in a royal procession. The truth is, we have found abundant proof that the matter is felt to be all too serious to be treated in such a manner.

There are few that have not been filled with awe by the multitudes that crowd to hear the gospel. We speak not of evening sermons; these may be attended through curiosity or a worse principle; but we speak of those congregations that are formed at the same time that the parish church bell is summoning to prayer. Where two or three hundred were expected, four or five are congregated, and where five hundred were expected we meet with a thousand. One cannot help feeling that this is the doing of the Lord; and when we make more particular inquiry into the state of the parish, our belief is confirmed, by discovering in some cases that three or four prayer meetings are held in the parish—of course *not* attended by the minister. We could speak, to the praise of a gracious Providence, of the fears of the widow excited by the anticipated displeasure of her landlord on the expiry of her lease—how, having counted the cost, she dared the danger, took her place on the Lord’s side, and found him not only better than her fears, but even exceeding her hopes; but our space forbids. Without farther extending these remarks, we conclude with expressing our conviction, that our country has reached a crisis that is either to terminate in its glory or its ruin. Oh that men may know this the day of their merciful visitation, and escape the misery of those that shall neglect the great salvation; and that, all everywhere that name the Lord Jesus Christ may earnestly implore the outpouring of the Spirit of Grace, to give courage in danger and counsel in difficulties, and that the Lord of the harvest would send forth labourers; for truly the harvest is plenteous, but the labourers are few!

### (3).—THE ROSS-SHIRE RIOTS.

On this subject we touched in our last, and have nothing to add save an extract which embodies, we believe, much of the reality of a

matter, which, in effect, has been greatly exaggerated. However serious they may turn out to be, let it be remembered that they belong, not to Free-Churchism, but to the old and infatuated INTRUSIONISM.

### THE RIOTS IN ROSS.

More settlements among the Residuary clergy in Ross-shire, and more riots among the people! We have no words to say how deeply we regret those unhappy, ill-judged outbreaks, which serve but to strengthen the hands of persecution,—by much too strong in that district already,—and to cloud the prospects, and embarrass the progress, of the Free Church. We regret them all the more on account of the poor simple people engaged in them,—men who have been hitherto the best-conditioned and most peaceable subjects in Britain, but who now, maddened by grievous oppression, are placing themselves wholly within the power of a high-handed lairdocracy, that already manifest what spirit they are of, by trampling on their sacred rights of conscience,—and of *ministers of the gospel*, more ruthless still, who give orders to the military to fire upon them with ball-cartridge. Poor mistaken Highlanders! your old recollections are deceiving you. The days have long gone by when, to protect yourselves from outrage and aggression, you had but to take down your broadswords from the wall, and range yourselves shoulder to shoulder. You live in an age in which the law, whether right or wrong in its findings, has become all potent in enforcing them, and in which any attempt on your parts either to supersede them or supplement them, must inevitably terminate in your own ruin first, and in the ruin, next of the Church you love so dearly.

Most of our readers must be aware that the only district in Scotland in which the evangelism of the Church never sank into a minority, is the district of Ross. From the times of Charles II., when it reckoned among its ejected ministers men whose names still occupy large space in the history of the persecution, and still live in the love and veneration of the people, by much the greater number of its clergy have been hard-working, devoted men, thoroughly respected and beloved. Ross-shire has been very much in this respect what La Vendee was in France at the Revolution, with this great difference, however, that while the ministers of Ross were more venerated and esteemed than ministers almost anywhere else, the proprietors of Ross, unlike those of La Vendee, were not venerated or esteemed at all. There must, of course, have been cause for this; and a cause in connection with at least one district of the country,—the one with which we are best acquainted,—may be easily rendered. We are old enough to remember a time when a man might have travelled a long day's journey, beginning at the hill of Cromarty, and speeding westwards, without passing through a single property save one, whose proprietor was not non-resident and a bankrupt. Now, in this very district, the ministers were of just two classes,—men whom the people did not recognise as ministers at all, and whose ministrations they would on no account attend,—and men whom they regarded with the most thorough affection and respect, and some of whom they were in the habit of assembling to hear, from all parts of the country, in congregations of ten and fifteen thousand. There is, perhaps, no place in the kingdom in which Moderatism is less respectable than in Ross,—certainly no place in the kingdom in which it is less respected. The Moderate incumbent there has but one character,—a character made up of facts about his dining with godless lairds, and then, with some eight or ten tumblers under his belt, losing his hat and his way on his return home; or of facts about his taking off his coat to fight with a parishioner, and getting

entangled in its folds; or of facts about his being challenged by his brethren of the better cast for exceeding at a Presbytery dinner; or of facts about his being a great farmer, and in that capacity raising the price of the boll on the poor. Such, we say, is the character of the Moderate parson in Ross,—a greatly exaggerated character, no doubt, but at least real in its existence, whatever the facts may be on which it professes to be founded. A minister in this primitive county is either more thoroughly venerated, or more thoroughly disliked and despised, than in any other county in the kingdom. The late disruption separated the two classes: the beloved and respected ministers of the people were thrown loose from the old parish churches, hallowed by the associations of centuries; the religion of the country was virtually disestablished; and the abhorred Moderates, whom the Ross-shire Highlanders cannot regard as ministers at all, became its only ministers of the Establishment. Now, this of itself must have seemed sufficiently hard in the eyes of the people. They felt that the parish churches formed *their* patrimony,—a patrimony long derived and highly valued,—and that they were now robbed of it; but the hardship extended much further. It was quite bad enough that they should be thus deprived of the churches in which their fathers had so long worshipped, and in which their venerated ministers had so long taught; but what formed the unbearable hardship in the case was, that the Ross-shire lairds, in the proportion of about three-fourths of their entire number,—men whose religious opinions are of just as little value as the people think them to be,—should have handed together to prevent them from having any other than those detested Moderates for their ministers. Let the reader but just think of the atrocity of the case, and then let him wonder, if he can, if, under such gross provocation, the patience of Scotch Highlanders should have given way.

One of the riots which we have to deplore took place at the parish church of Logie in Easter Ross. A strong body of parishioners surrounded the building, and prevented the Residuary presentee, one of the batch lately inducted at Dingwall, and the few lairds and lairds' ladies by whom he was accompanied, from making their way into it, to get through the important ceremony of the introductory discourse. Why? What could have incited men to combine in this way for purposes of open violence, who in all their lives before were never engaged in an outrage! Amid the details of a grossly exaggerated account in the *Ross-shire Advertiser*, we learn that the people, addressing themselves to the proprietors, "said that if a site were given to them for a church in the parish, they would desist from further annoyance." The excellent minister of the *parishioners of Logie* has quitted the Establishment, and thrown up his worldly all for the sake of his principles; and the people, almost to a man, quit the Establishment with him. But the lairds combine; and resolve, in order that people and minister may be torn apart, and the Residuary church filled, that there shall not be an inch of standing-room afforded them in the parish. And hence the riot,—a palpable effect of that grinding, irritating persecution, which makes even wise men mad. The *Ross-shire Advertiser* informs us, that Lady Ross of Balnagown, in driving up to the church, was assailed with violent abuse, and not only so, but that she was actually struck at by a woman with a stick, and received the blow on her arm. We are exceedingly sorry that it should have been so. We are sorry that Lady Ross should have been struck. The woman did a very wrong and a very foolish thing, and will, we daresay, very severely suffer for it. But does no blame attach to Lady Ross herself? There is a little hollow on the Balnagown property, surrounded by wooded banks,—the memorials, Agassiz would tell us, of an ancient glacier, that once descended from the hills. It is a picturesque, sheltered spot, well known to all the gipsies of the north of Scotland. They occasionally pitch their tents in it in the warmer

seasons ; and the traveller, as he passed by, may see the smoke of their fire curling from amid the trees. No one ever interferes with them. They look romantic and pretty ; and when some neighbouring farmers complained, a few years ago, that they were missing poultry and linen ; and just hinted that it might be well to eject the gipsies, they were told by the gentleman who was factor on the property at the time, an excellent and ingenious man, that if they but dealt generously with the gipsies, the gipsies would deal generously by them. But though Lady Ross can tolerate the gipsies in the hollow, the Free Church, it seems, she cannot tolerate. On sacramental occasions the Gaelic congregation, by much too large to be accommodated under a roof, used to assemble in its shelter ; and, immediately on the disruption there was an humble request preferred to her Ladyship, that the people, as on these occasions, might be permitted to meet in it for the purposes of public worship. But the humble request was met by a prompt and decided refusal. No.—they were not to worship there. The disreputable vagabond might appropriate it if he willed,—the vagrant tinker, the sturdy beggar, the jockie, and the thief, might feast in it over their purloined food ; but the children of the soil were not to be permitted to assemble in its shelter, to worship their God agreeably to the dictates of their consciences. Lady Ross of Balnagown will no doubt get the woman severely punished who struck at her Ladyship with the stick. It will be, of course, quite natural and proper, and eminently satisfactory, that the woman should be punished ; but Lady Ross, who has poetry in her album, would perhaps do well to remember, that even the crushed worm writhes itself up against the foot that treads upon it, and that they who ruthlessly trample on their fellow-creatures, find often the pavement an exceedingly unsolid one. The woman was unquestionably muck in the wrong, Lady Ross, to strike your Ladyship ; but is your Ladyship not somewhat in the wrong also ? “ The earth is the Lord’s ; ” nor can *your* unquestioned right to the Barony of Balnagown in any degree abrogate *His*. And as He commands the people who live on your property to worship Him, holding by Christ the Head, there must be some mistake surely in the counter orders of your Ladyship.

Another of the Ross-shire riots,—we regret to say, a more serious one than that of Logic,—took place at Resolis, in the attempt to settle there the Residuary who is to draw the stipend of the parish. Our readers in the south have scarce an idea of the utter desolation which fell on the churches of this district at the disruption. In our southern parishes there was at least a form of worship maintained in the Establishment,—the empty churches had at least their skeleton services ; but in Ross the empty churches were locked up for weeks and months together. Moderatism, as if panic-struck for a time, altogether deserted the field. We were in a sea-port town in the neighbourhood of Resolis nearly two months after the disruption, on the Sunday morning in which the church of that parish was preached vacant. There was the rattle of a gig heard in the quiet streets, as if driving for life and death ; and a messenger alighted in hot haste to see whether among the *debris* of a sea-port and manufacturing town, it might not be possible to procure for handsome pay a beadle and precentor for the church of Resolis. In the parish itself not one man, woman, or child, was to be found who would so much as toll the bell. In the sea-port town, however, the search proved successful : there was a beadle and precentor found,—the one ; as we have heard, at the rate of five, the other of fifteen shillings ; and, mounting the gig, they drove off together, and arrived just in time. The bellman began to toll, when, lo ! a catastrophe. During the confusion of the disruption, the worthy clergyman of the people of Resolis had lost a swarm of bees ; and the bees, deeming the church bell exceedingly like a hive, and knowing instinctively, no doubt, that they were not to be very soon

disturbed in it, had clustered round the tongue, and begun to build. Toll, toll, went the bell,—buz, buz, buz, went the bees; but, perceiving at length whence the annoyance proceeded, down they descended in a dark cloud on the head of the unhappy bellman, who, ill at ease in his conscience at the time, and forecasting the possibility of some frightful visitation, threw up his hands in an agony of horror and consternation, and dashed away at full speed, chased by the bees, like Orestes of old when pursued by the Furies. We relate the incident, from the illustration which, amid its extreme ludicrousness, it furnishes of the utter desolation which fell through the disruption, on the Establishment, in this northern parish. The congregation on the memorable day of the bees, though gathered from five several parishes, did not exceed thirty. The sounds, when they sung, scarce equalled those made by the angry insects in the bell. Our readers must have observed, from a paragraph which appeared some time since in our columns, that the *call* of the Residuary clergyman, whose attempted settlement was the unhappy occasion of the riot of Thursday last, though subscribed by six heritors, was signed by only one parishioner on the communicants' roll. And yet here, as in Logie, was the coarse attempt made by the proprietary to coerce the parishioners into attendance. There is not in Scotland a minister more thoroughly beloved by his people than the Rev. Mr. Sage of Resolis. His father, a respected clergyman of Sutherlandshire, long since departed, was almost the only man in the county who took his stand manfully on the side of the poor tenants, against the aggressions of the proprietor, and denounced the enormities of the *clearing* as at once flagrantly iniquitous and disgracefully cruel. Nor is the son unworthy of the father; nor is he less esteemed or less looked up to by the people. And yet, when a *lady* of Resolis,—the mother of an extensive proprietor,—was requested by a deputation of the parishioners to permit them to roof over for their respected minister the ruinous walls of an ancient chapel, far from the parish church, and around which they buried their dead, her insulting and ill-mannered reply was, that all she would give of the burying-ground to their minister would be just "the length of his body." Here, as at Logie, the Free Church,—the Church of all the people,—would not have had a single inch of ground to stand on, were it not for the generosity of one liberal proprietor, Sir George Gun Munro of Poyntzfield,—the same gentleman who, maugre the Duke of Sutherland, has granted a site to the inhabitants of Dornoch; and he has been able only to furnish them with a bit of ground on the extreme confines of the parish, for such is the situation of his property. But though the master scheme of the proprietary has failed in this way, other means of annoyance have been plied, thick and manifold. When attending the Free Church congregation in Cromarty, about six weeks ago, there were pointed out to us two respectable-looking men in livery, the servants of a Resolis proprietor. "Poor fellows," said our informant, "their master has gone to hear the Residuary minister on the Brae-head, and *they* have come to forfeit their places by attending here." To compel attendance at the Residuary church, servants have been dismissed in this parish,—labourers refused employment,—and tenants and cottars threatened; the people have at length lost patience, and there have been formidable riots in consequence, where riots were never known before.

The induction of the Residuary presentee to Resolis had been fixed to take place at the parish church on Thursday last. The Sheriff had taken the precaution of interdicting the ferry-boats at Invergordon, Alness, and Fowlia, from crossing the Frith with, of course, the intention of preventing such of the Highlanders on the northern side as had been engaged in the previous riots, from joining the parishioners of Resolis. Nor does it seem that any of them succeeded in getting across. The Residuary, Presbytery,



however, when, accompanied by the Lord Lieutenant and the Sheriff, they arrived at the church, found it guarded by a body of the parishioners, sufficiently strong of themselves to prevent their approach : a party of men on the Preventive station, armed with pistol and cutlass, were brought to force away ; the riot act was read, and the Preventive men fired at the parishioners, using only blank cartridge ; but were assaulted, in return, by such a continuous volley of stones, as compelled them to fall back. Amid the uproar and the confusion, the voice of a Residuary parson was heard crying, "*Load with ball ; do your duty ; make examples.*" The reverend gentleman was desirous, it would seem, to make an *impression* on the people, and knew full well his inability of making an impression on them in any other way.

The Preventive men loaded and fired three rounds ; but not a Resolite man budged ; and on the third round, they, rushed upon the authorities *en masse*, and bore Presbytery and Preventive men,—Sheriff and Lord Lieutenant,—down the hill. We sincerely regret to learn that the Preventive Service commanding officer, Lieutenant Thomson, was severely injured in the *melee*,—we regret it all the more, that we know him to be an honourable-minded man,—prepared in every case to do his duty, but who, we are sure, would have very thoroughly disliked the work of this day. The parishioners were left in possession of the church,—all except one, a female, who had been seen, says the *Ross-shire Advertiser*, "cheering on the rioters," and whom a Mr. William Watson, a Cromarty magistrate, skilful, like an old Homeric hero, in selecting his antagonist, had succeeded in capturing and forcing into a gig. She was brought to Cromarty and lodged in prison. The Presbytery,—including of course, the Rev. Mr. Ball Cartridge, minister of the Gospel,—retreated to Fortrose, where they inducted the presentee of Resolite in the inn. And we are informed by the *Ross-shire Advertiser*, that the unfortunate men, "on entering and leaving that place," full six miles, be it remembered, from the scene of the riot, "were hooted and pelted with stones."

On the evening after the ceremony had taken place at Fortrose, a party of Resolite men entered the town of Cromarty, and, passing through the streets in a compact body, halted in front of the jail. They had come, they said, to bail out the woman. The magistrates were soon on the spot, and remonstrated with them. The truly excellent minister of the people of Cromarty, Mr. Stewart, earnestly did the same, but to no purpose ; the poor simple Highlanders remained for two full hours urging on the authorities to accept of their bail, and release the woman ; and then finding that their bail was not to be accepted, they rushed upon the building, set her free in a few minutes, and bore her off to Resolite in triumph. Poor mistaken people ! A detachment of their body, in investing the jail, had to make their way through the flower-garden of a lady in the neighbourhood. She was looking at them with extreme anxiety, well aware of the mischief into which they were so heedlessly running themselves ; but, mistaking the cause of her solicitude, they supposed she was merely alarmed for her flowers. "Ah, lady," they said, as they carefully threaded the narrow walks, "diuna be feart for the floors ; we winna tramp ane o' them." And they kept their word. The incident reminds us of one somewhat similar,—an incident illustrative, at least, of the same trait of character,—which belongs to the times when a party of Highlanders last entered Cromarty on an errand of violence. It was in the year Forty-five, and the party on this occasion were the soldiers of the Prince. The grandmother of the writer, then a very little girl, was engaged at the moment in carrying a jug of milk along the streets, and, alarmed by the sudden apparition of a body of armed men, she stumbled, in her haste to escape, and fell and broke the jug. A cry of earnest regret arose from the party ; there came half-a-dozen of them running up

to her at once ; and one of the number, carefully raising her from the ground, and wiping her face with the corner of his plaid, exclaimed, in tones of the deepest sympathy, " Ah, poor sing, poor sing, hersell wadna hurt a pit o' you."

The military are to be set loose on Ross ; and the Residuary Church bids fair to bear blood on her skirts,—blood which, in the circumstances, will not and cannot be regarded as other than that of murder. It is legislation, not bayonets, that are required,—legislation through which the benefit of the Toleration Laws may be extended to the Highlands of Scotland. We know not what our infatuated rulers intend. They have already the Repealers of Ireland to deal with ; Rebecca and her daughters are busy in Wales ; and in our manufacturing districts, Chartism numbers its forces by millions. Are not all these enough ? Are the best conditioned districts of Britain to be converted, through unbearable oppression, into scenes of burning discontent and fierce disaffection also. It will be the imbecility of idiotism, —any, still more hopeless, the blind infatuation of coming judgment, if to Ireland, Wales, and our manufacturing districts, the Highlands of Scotland be added. And yet, now is the moment for our rulers to decide. What do they purpose to themselves ? Is it to carve with the bayonet-point a way into the affections of the people, through which their Rev. Messrs. Ball Cartridges may enter ? Are they determined to make the people love their clergy very much in this way ? Alas ! the experiment must prove a failure. There awaits for these Rev. Messrs. Ball Cartridges nought save unmeasured contempt and unmitigated detestation. Nor will our rulers be able to reverse the destiny, even should they murder, in their behalf, whole hecatombs of poor mistaken Highlanders.

## 2.—FREE CHURCH CAUSE IN ENGLAND.

Our readers are aware that Deputations of our Scottish Brethren have been sent to England, to receive proffered contributions, and to plead for more, in aid the Church Building Fund. The extracts which follow, will shew the welcome which they have received—and the progress, the surprising progress of English sympathies towards our Church Freedom cause. The subject is so important, the facts are so gratifying, that we do not grudge room—and we hope our readers will not grudge time.

### DEPUTATIONS TO ENGLAND.

It is known to our readers that strong desires have long been entertained by our friends in the south, that deputations should be sent to them, to expound the principles, explain the position, and raise funds for the support of the Free Church. Prior to the disruption, request after request was urgently sent for such visits to England, and the feeling was general there that an opportunity for spreading sound principles was lost by neglecting to comply with those requests. But since the disruption frequent deputations, it is well known, have been sent ; and the zeal in the Free Church's cause, the ready sanction yielded to its principles, the impression made by its sacrifices, and the contributions given to its funds, have been such as to render it now not merely expedient, but absolutely necessary, that more deputations be forthwith sent. London, Manchester, Liverpool, York, Bristol, Bath, Chester, Newcastle, Leeds, and other places, have already been visited

either by deputations or individual ministers ; and the enthusiasm displayed in them all, without one exception, has been such as to make it duty for the Free Church not to leave so ample a field uncultivated. There are, no doubt, difficulties in the way. How can ministers be spared from Scotland in sufficient numbers to do so great a work? Amid the present pressure and loud calls for gospel ministrations, and the consequent overtasking of our ministers, how can even five be sent away? But surely neither the people will grudge the absence of their pastors for three or four weeks, nor the pastors themselves be reluctant to go, when properly commissioned, seeing that not merely the increase of our funds, but, what is of far more moment for the welfare of our nation,—the spread of our principles as recognising none but Christ as the Ruler in His own house,—imperatively demands such a measure. Holding these views, we rejoice, and are sure that thousands will rejoice with us, to understand, that a plan has been formed, and will most probably be submitted to next Assembly, by which England shall be visited, and, if possible, thoroughly pervaded, by effective deputations. The plan is simple. To divide the southern section of the kingdom into a certain number of districts, large or small, according to the population,—to appoint a certain number of ministers to take charge of each, with the co-operation of the friendly Dissenting brethren,—to pre-arrange plans for visiting all the chief places, and so to take measures for at once raising funds for the erection of our churches,—for spreading those principles which no act of Parliament can long dam up,—for removing those obstacles which have too long kept the different portions of Christ's Church asunder,—and for strengthening those bonds which the Lord of all may bless for preparing his Church in these lands to resist the corruptions that are setting in like a flood. We have before us at this moment urgent requests for deputations from four remote points—Southampton, London, Birmingham, and York. One of the letters contains an organised system for visiting a whole county, and that one of the most wealthy in England. In short, not merely in Scotland, but throughout the three kingdoms, the principles of the Free Church, *now embodied in practice*, are approved and responded to by thousands. The hostility with which our cause has been encountered is rousing the generous sympathies of Englishmen. Interest, Christian expediency, and pure scriptural principle, all conspire to urge the necessity of not neglecting this tide at the full ; and we are confident that the Assembly which meets on the 17th of October, will do all that is desirable in the matter. Our friends in England, we feel assured, will have their urgent requests complied with immediately thereafter.

---

The deputation to the north of England, consisting of Dr. Paterson of Glasgow, and Mr. Buchan of Hamilton, have returned, bringing with them the most gratifying accounts of their mission. Their exertions were powerfully seconded by Christians of all evangelical denominations, from all of whom they received a cordial welcome. Everywhere their statements were listened to with intense earnestness, and followed by resolutions expressive of sympathy with the Free Church in her sufferings, and of determination to aid her in her righteous cause. The sum contributed to the funds of the Church, through the deputation, is not less than £1,200, and might have been much larger had there been sufficient time for thoroughly occupying the district, and if the necessary arrangements had been previously made for that purpose. Nor is the addition to the funds the only advantage derived from the labours of the deputation. It is peculiarly gratifying to learn that the principles for which the Free Church has been honoured to contend in this country are making progress in England, especially at a period when the spread of Puseyism in that portion of the empire threatens

with destruction all that is Protestant in her ecclesiastical Establishment. The various deputations from the Free Church are rendering unspeakably important service in this respect, as also in cherishing and extending the desire, already so general and ardent, of a union among Christians on a broad Scriptural basis. And on these accounts, not less than with a view to the immediate benefit of the Free Church, it seems to be an obvious duty to multiply deputations all over England, that every part of the country may be made thoroughly aware of the principles involved in the present controversy,—than which nothing more is required to impress the conviction that they are of supreme importance and universal application.

Chester, 20th September, 1843.

On Sabbath last, the Rev. W. Arnott of Glasgow preached three impressive and eloquent sermons in this city,—in the forenoon in the Independent chapel, in the afternoon in the Wesleyan chapel, and in the evening in the Octagon (Lady Huntingdon's connection) chapel,—all of which were attended by very large congregations; indeed, the enthusiasm in favour of the *Free Church* knows no bounds, and increases from day to day in this city; all denominations seem to vie with each other to do homage to those *illustrious, great men*, who, for conscience-sake, and for the spreading of vital *godliness* throughout the world, have voluntarily relinquished every emolument derived from State connection, and burst asunder the Erastian fetters manufactured to bind them fast to a corrupted Establishment.

Placards were circulated, announcing that a meeting would be held on Tuesday evening, in the Town Hall, at seven o'clock, to hear addresses in favour of the *Free Church of Scotland*. At the hour of meeting the spacious hall was densely crowded. The Rev. Samuel Luke (Independent minister), was called to the chair; and, after prayer by Rev. Mr. Bird (Lady Huntingdon's connection), the Rev. J. J. Wood, late of Old Greyfriars Church, Edinburgh, Rev. Wm. Arnott of Glasgow, and Rev. Mr. Gardner (Woodside Scotch Church), severally addressed the audience in animated and eloquent speeches, which eclipsed anything of the kind ever heard in this city. Tremendous bursts of enthusiasm frequently greeted the Rev. gentlemen during their addresses. Had there been a Residuary there, what would have been his feelings at beholding the tribute paid by the citizens of Chester to the ministers of Christ, who, rather than a single stain should be inflicted on his "*glorious crown*" by the men of this world, have given up their earthly all, "and thrown themselves upon the Christian people of Scotland for support, however scanty, despising the vain and futile efforts of ungodly men to tarnish the royal diadem," and bind the servants of the *living God* to a polluted sanctuary, by accepting terms, compromising the "*Headship of Christ*."

After the deputation's address, a resolution was moved by Rev. Mr. Williams, and seconded by Rev. Mr. Clarkson (Wesleyan), highly commendatory of the step taken by the protesting ministers, and unanimously passed by the whole assembly rising and holding up their hands; and, after singing a hymn, the mighty concourse separated, highly pleased with the evening's proceedings, as evinced by the "liberal contribution towards the funds of the Free Church."

#### SYMPATHY WITH THE FREE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

The following extract, from a circular lately issued by the Western Association of Baptist Churches in England, will show how prompt our friends are to welcome the deputations that are now in course of preparation for visiting

the south. Let the Committee only make proper arrangements, and the Assembly give their full sanction to the measure, and results may follow of unspeakable importance to pure religion both in the north and south :—

“With respect to the Free Church of Scotland, I take the present opportunity of stating, that our Address, agreed to at the last association, and duly forwarded to Dr. Chalmers, was received by him with ‘very great pleasure,’ and will be laid by him before the next meeting of the General Assembly, which takes place at Glasgow in October. ‘It is truly encouraging to us,’ he observes, ‘that we should have so many demonstrations from England, both of their sympathy with ourselves, and their general approval of our cause.’

“I trust our sympathy will not be in word only, but that a cordial and generous response will be given by our friends to the call now made upon them. It should not be forgotten that the men who now solicit our assistance in building their houses of prayer, have ever been disposed to help us, heart and hand, in our missionary enterprises in the world. Fuller and Ryland, to whom, amongst others, Dr. Chalmers refers, as being ‘in early life the best and most illustrious of his Christian friends,’ at all times met with warm encouragement and liberal support, in their great undertaking, from the evangelical members of the Scottish Kirk.

“I may be permitted to suggest, that a public meeting, in connection with other religious denominations in the place, would most effectually secure the object in view, as well as present to the world, in these divided times, an interesting exhibition of Christian unity and co-operation. It is to be hoped that nothing will interfere to prevent your reception of the deputation at the time that may be selected. Would it not be well to confer at once on the subject, with other Christian ministers in your town, that they, as well as yourself, may be prepared for the occasion.

“I remain, dear brother, your faithfully,

“H. TREND.

“*Secretary to the Western Association of Baptist Churches.*”

“*Bridgewater, August 28th, 1843.*”

The following is the motion adopted by this Christian body at its recent meeting :—

“**FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.**—*Resolved*,—That this Committee desires to express its willingness to co-operate with other religious denominations, in augmenting the funds now being raised for the erection of places of worship for the members of the Free Church of Scotland; and that the churches of this association be recommended to receive the deputation from that Church with Christian liberality.”

Similar encouragement is held out, we understand, in a spirit of large Christian liberality, all over England, from Cornwall to Berwick-on-Tweed; and, when the Free Church shall have recovered her strength, after the sufferings which have been lately inflicted, we hope to see this Christian sympathy responded to, and these invitations all accepted.

#### GENERAL PROGRESS.

Though there be many difficulties still lying in the way of our friends in their great undertaking to plant Free Churches wherever they are needed, yet, seen in the light of past experience, these difficulties may now be re-

garded as daily diminishing,—the cause of the Free Church has triumphed. We do not for one breath undervalue the sufferings that must yet be endured, or the sacrifices that must yet be made. In cases not a few, the oppressed and deeply injured ministers are only beginning to feel the effects of the injustice with which they have been treated; and unless the friends of religion were to become their friends, their trials would increase. But we speak of the principles of the Free Church. They are no longer on their trial; it has been proved in the experience of a few months, what sound and indomitable truth can accomplish; and we now only need time and ministers to see the Free Church, in effect and thoroughly, as it is already in principle the Church of the people of Scotland who formerly adhered to the Establishment. We have no quarrel with the name which has been given to it; but were our enemies to deny us the title of the Church of Scotland, we might perhaps prefer another,—the Church of the Scotch. “Your Church,” said an acute, intelligent French Protestant, who has just visited Edinburgh to witness the proceedings of our friends and our ecclesiastical position,—“Your Church will establish herself, will sustain herself,—*she will live.*” We believe it. “She will live,” might become her motto, because **THE LIFE** is on her side; and we find a signal illustration of her power of life in the fact, that in the districts where martyrs were most rife,—for example, in Penpont and Galloway,—the people are resolute well nigh to a man in abandoning the Establishment as no longer theirs.

But it is not merely in Scotland that she will live. There are symptoms of vigorous vitality already appearing in England. Some of our ministers have been repeatedly urged to go to London to open new Presbyterian churches there; and this, we venture to hint, should not be neglected. It is a fact, that some of the more godly of the English, wearied out by the Puseyism which is giving to men a serpent instead of a fish, are seeking spiritual shelter and spiritual food in the Scottish churches. Contemporaneously with that, some of the Scottish ministers in England are finding retreats in the more congenial region of Aberdeenshire, and similar localities, after leaving such principles as they had, or at least professed to have, on the south of the Tweed. Could their places, therefore, be supplied by some evangelical ministers,—such as some we could mention already in England,—men who would feed the famished souls of those who sought their ministry,—a mighty advantage would be gained, and a strong ally for the Free Church raised up in the south. The deputations that have already been sent to England, and are yet to go, may largely promote this result; and thus, while our ministers and laymen have thought chiefly of raising funds for our oppressed Church, it may be found that spiritual freedom will be advanced, as more important still. The very result which Sir R. Peel sought toward off, by endeavouring to quash our principles, may, by his ill-judged efforts, be advanced. Of one thing we are already certain. Had we men in sufficient numbers to pervade England, and proclaim our principles, a great Protestant league could, without much difficulty, be formed between Christian men of all denominations there and the Free Church in Scotland.

#### ADDRESS OF THE “LONDON LAY UNION.”

The “London Lay Union” has just published an excellent and powerfully written address to the “friends of Presbytery throughout England and Wales.” It is entitled “**UNION IS STRENGTH,**” and its object is to point out the mustering forces of error throughout the sister kingdom, and the necessity of an immediate and strong confederacy on the part of the friends of

truth. The insidious but rapid progress of Puseyism,—the triumph of Moderatism,—the antichristian principles avowed by our rulers, and acted upon by our Judges, are all clearly pointed out; and the Christian people of England are strongly urged to form themselves into associations, whose object it shall be, in concert with the parent society in London, to diffuse sound and scriptural principles everywhere, and resist the common foe. We quote the following passage from this excellent tract:—

Let us *first* glance at the state of the Church of England. Still Protestant in name, she has to a lamentable extent ceased to be so. The Church of Cranmer and Jewel, of Latimer and Ridley, will, we fear, soon be, if it is not already, governed by a party who cast out as evil the names of these venerable Reformers, and who, having openly avowed their determination to “*unprotestantize*” the National Church, give ample proof of their steady resolve to accomplish that end, by exalting the authority of “the Church” above that of the Bible,—rejecting the corner-stone of the gospel edifice, justification by faith alone,—asserting the regenerating efficacy of sacraments when administered by an episcopally ordained clergy, and the meritorious value of good works and deeds of penance,—inculcating the doctrine of reserve, the duty of auricular confession, the belief of purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the invocation of saints,—adopting the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, the very words and the entire ceremonial of the mass-book,—praising the unmarried state as best suited to the holiness of the priest’s office,—proposing plans for the establishment of convents and monasteries,—and recognising “the Papal Antichrist” as a dear sister in the Lord.

The party, dear friends, which hold these alarming views, is neither small nor powerless. It has its representatives, not only among the inferior clergy, but in the senate, the cabinet, our halls of learning, and on the bench of bishops; it numbers among its zealous disciples an overwhelming majority of the younger clergy; and day by day, we hear of those “who seemed to be pillars,” yielding under the pressure that threatens, ere long, to break down and annihilate all that gives strength and beauty to the Established Church of England. And if we are startled by the unwonted frequency of the announcements that this and that clergyman of the English Church has embraced the Romish faith, there is much more to startle and alarm in the certainty that, for *one* who has acted an honest part and gone over to Rome, *hundreds*, who are Papists in feeling, and Jesuits in practice, continue to eat the bread of a church whose doctrines, and whose very *name*, they abjure; and that the *sworn* guardians of the flock are admitting “ravening wolves” into the fold, without even the “sheep’s clothing” of a nominal orthodoxy, and with full liberty to “kill and to destroy,” provided they disturb not their delusive repose.

We are not careful to answer those who may charge us, because of these remarks, with impertinent interference in what does not at all concern us. Those faithful members of the Established Church, whose “souls weep in secret places, whose eyes run down with tears, because the Lord’s flock is carried away captive,” who pray earnestly for “the spirit of counsel and might,” to guide and to strengthen them in this their hour of darkness and difficulty, with whom we deeply sympathize, whose sympathy we highly value, whose brotherly aid we would still more gladly welcome, will not, we feel assured, take up any such reproach against us. But while we utterly condemn and repudiate the cold and selfish principle that would confine the regards of Christians within the narrow boundaries of their own little sect or party, and thus perpetuate disunion in “the body of Christ,” we maintain that if, when “one member suffers, all the members suffer with it,” then the “unprotestantizing” of the Church of England is our own direct

and immediate concern. As Christian, as Protestants, as free-born Britons, we are bound, since the watchmen on Zion's walls continue silent, to "lift up our voice like a trumpet, to cry aloud and spare not."

In various quarters of the world, the evangelic principle is coming into collision with the civil power. The opposition of the latter is manifested in various ways, some more, some less direct. One of the surest proofs of the presence of the above-mentioned principle in an individual or Church is, the manifestation and growth of the missionary spirit. The Church of Scotland signalized herself by erecting, in the course of *five years, three times* as many churches as had been built during the *previous century*; but because the possession, by the ministers, of full *spiritual* powers was held to affect certain *civil* rights, the Civil Courts placed an arrest on this noble movement. The same spirit having sprung up among the evangelical clergy of the Protestant Church in France, their *right to preach the gospel* where they pleased was brought before the Civil Courts in the now famous case of Sennerville, and *NEGATIVED* on four distinct appeals, in direct opposition to the words of the Charter of 1830, which guarantees "equal liberty of worship to all sects;" so that, in virtue of a regulation of police, which has been repeatedly declared by ministers of the Crown to have no reference to religious meetings, the preaching of Protestant truth throughout France is suspended on the will of a single—and he may be a Popish—Minister of State. The zeal, activity, and rapidly growing numbers and influence of the Irish Presbyterian clergy, have been rewarded in the Courts of Law by a decision that they are not ordained ministers, and that mixed marriages celebrated by them are no marriages at all. The same symptoms of life in the clergy of the Canton de Vaud in Switzerland have induced the civil authorities to abolish their Confession of Faith, and to declare themselves supreme judges in all causes spiritual. In the United States of America, the power of evangelic principle has shown itself in a resolution of the Presbyterian Church to exercise discipline on those who have been married (as the law of the land allows) to their deceased wives' sisters; thus bringing into inevitable collision the statute law, and that of which the law of the American Assembly is the natural expression, the spirit of the gospel. Thus we see that the present is a season of widespread conflict between the laws of man and the law of God concerning His Church, and that the enmity of "the powers that be," notwithstanding they are "ordained of God" to be His "ministers of good," is proportioned to the church's zeal in fulfilling the behests of Him who hath commanded her to "occupy till He come." ALL the churches engaged in this warfare are Presbyterian. They have been honoured to strike the first blow for truth, and are but the outposts of the great army of the faithful, pioneering the way for "the battle of the great day of the Lord Almighty."

- In recommending to you, dear friends and countrymen, who adhere to the Free church, the *immediate formation of lay unions in your respective localities* permit us to remind you, that not only have you a general call, but "necessity is laid upon you," to be up and doing without delay. The church of your fathers is no longer established by the State. Even at the moment when her fast ripening clusters were giving promise of a glorious harvest, was the axe uplifted against that noble vine, which the Lord's "right hand had planted," which had not only "taken deep root, and filled the land" of our birth, and the home of our affections, but had "sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river," so that we, in this land of the stranger, rejoice in her shade. We beseech you, therefore, by the ties of kindred,—by the memory of our fathers, many of whom held office within her pale,—by the inestimable privileges we enjoyed in childhood, and in ear-



ly youth,—by the sacred recollections of “the times of old,”—forthwith to contribute, as God hath prospered you, towards the *maintenance* in Scotland of those principles for which so many devoted ministers have laid down their earthly all; and to take immediate steps for *extending* them throughout this your adopted country. Hitherto we have been weak, because disunited. God, in his providence, is now presenting to us a powerful motive to united exertion, is calling us to a high and holy vocation; if we engage in it, we shall assuredly find that “a blessing is in it,”—if we neglect it, the hour of trial, which is fast approaching, shall find us unprepared, and defenceless as now.

But believing, as we do, that a time of trial awaits all the evangelical churches in these islands, we likewise appeal to our Christian brethren in other communions. We know that many an English heart warms towards our suffering church, admires the courage and devotedness with which she has “lifted up a standard for the truth,” and “prays for the peace of Jerusalem.” And though the “floods lift up their waves, and the mountains shake with the swelling thereof,” the spirit of unity, blessed be God, is moving, dove-like, on the face of the troubled waters, at once the emblem and dispenser of purity and peace.

We are thoroughly convinced that a powerful re-action against the spirit of Popish and Erastian encroachment is rapidly springing up in England,—that it was mightily fostered by Sir James Graham’s Factory Bill, and that it will be blown into a flame by the approaching deputations in reference to our persecuted Church. By the time that Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds, are thoroughly aroused,—that London, the mighty heart of England, is stirred,—that Oxford, Cambridge, Canterbury, York, and all the cathedral towns have been visited,—we are convinced that the Christian people of England will see (what thousands of them see already), that our question is destined to shake the empire, and to be, as in the times of the Covenant, the true antagonist of Puseyism of spiritual tyranny on the one hand, and of civil despotism on the other. It is a wonderful and mysterious Providence by which Sir Robert Peel is made the instrument of forcing a flood of active Scotchmen across the border, by which; after another revolution of two centuries, the cloud, small as a man’s hand, which rests at first on our Scottish mountains, is at length made again to cover the whole of England.”

The London Union have done well, at such a period, to strike in with their eloquent and seasonable address. We trust it will be widely showered over the south, and that any of our friends who can afford it will send their contributions to aid in its effectual dissemination. We trust also that the “London Union” will speedily carry out their project of starting a metropolitan newspaper. It could well be launched into a large circulation on the flood of agitation which will be commenced in England immediately after the Glasgow Assembly; and it would not only be a powerful engine in defence of truth, but a powerful bond of union amongst the faithful Non-conformists of Scotland, Ireland, England, and Wales, as well as a beacon of light to the Christian world.

---

### THE FREE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

(From a Correspondent of the Guardian.)

London, 4th Sept., 1843.

I have delayed writing to you till now, in the hope of being able to communicate something satisfactory regarding our prospects here. And I am happy to say I have not waited in vain. This afternoon’s post

brought us the welcome intelligence that the whole subject of deputations to England had at length been formally brought before the Provisional Committee, and that immediate steps are to be taken for evoking the sympathy and securing the contributions of the English public. Mr. Jaffary, whose talent for arrangement, and indefatigable zeal in promoting the success of the Church's Schemes, are so well known, is, we suppose, ere now at Manchester, and is to be followed by several ministers and laymen, in order to take advantage of the intense interest excited in that city. Of the extent and cordiality of that interest, you may form some idea, when I state, that no less than *twenty* pulpits are placed at the disposal of the Free Church for next Sabbath, the 10th instant; and not only so, but the friendly ministers of various denominations at once resolved to exchange with each other on that day, and themselves to advocate the cause of their suffering brethren in Scotland, in those pulpits which cannot be supplied by the members of the Scottish deputation. This is a truly noble example, and one which is worthy of general imitation; and we believe that the result of the great meeting to be held on Tuesday, and of Sabbath's simultaneous effort, will be most important, not only as regards Manchester, but the whole of England. Still farther, as showing the intelligent interest taken in the question by the Non-Conformists of Manchester, I may mention that the Rev. Mr. Fletcher, one of the Independent clergymen there, has drawn up and published a most admirable sketch of the whole controversy, in the form of a tract, which is fitted to be of essential service in making our case known among his brethren in England.

The feeling aroused in York is so strong, that assurances have reached us that there has been nothing like it in that archiepiscopal city for many years; and we have received the most urgent applications for a second visit, from persons connected with the Free Church; and the largest room in the city (capable of containing 3,000 hearers) has been, or is to be, bespoke for the intended meeting. An amusing incident occurred at the meeting lately held there. Mr. Begg having made a passing allusion, in his very eloquent and able address, to "the flood of error that is coming in upon the Church of England," four ladies of respectable age immediately started to their feet, and having contrived to force their way towards the door, through the densely crowded passages, one of them, unable to suppress the virtuous indignation that was glowing within, looked steadfastly at Mr. Begg, in the spirit of Jenny Geddes of glorious memory, but having no cutty stool to launch at the obnoxious presbyter, shook her clenched fist at him, and then retired. Suffice it to say, the granddame's nod, unlike that of Jove, did not "shake the spheres," or distract the equanimity of the Free Church minister—the vacant places were instantaneously occupied, and the proceedings went on with the utmost harmony. In York, as in many other places, the Non-Conformists feel that we are conferring a benefit on them, by stirring them up to exert their energies against the rapidly growing intolerance of the Established Church. Applications have also been made from Birmingham, and arrangements are in progress there for a public meeting, to be followed up by active efforts; and Gravesend and Southampton are impatient for information on the subject. So soon as we get definite information regarding the arrival of the deputation from Scotland, we shall make arrangements for effective operations in each of these localities. The only collection that has been made since I wrote to you was in the Baptist Chapel, Battersea (the Rev. Mr. Soule's) after a sermon by the Rev. Mr. Burns on Sabbath se'nnight, and amounted to £10. This sum, contributed by a congregation of only 300 persons, is justly reckoned very liberal, and shows the cordial feeling

and sympathy and good-will that prevails among them towards the Free Church.

I was informed the other day of a highly gratifying circumstance. The directors of the Chester and Crewe Railway have built a chapel for the men employed on the line, and appointed a Puseyite as clergyman. It seems there are several hundred Scotsmen in the employment of the Company, and the Rev. Mr. Gardner, the highly esteemed and laborious Presbyterian minister at Woodside, had repeatedly visited Crewe, and preached to them. On being ordered to attend the Puseyite chapel, the men refused; and when threatened with dismissal, in the event of their continued refusal, they met together, and resolved to have a Presbyterian church of their own. From what I know of the energy of purpose that exists among the Lancashire Presbyterians, I am much mistaken if the project be not soon accomplished.

As regards ourselves, I am happy to say that, through the kindness of the Commissioners of Census, the books are now placed at the disposal of the Lay Union, and we are immediately to commence copying the names of our countrymen, with their respective places of abode, in the metropolis. The importance of this information it is difficult to overrate. It will add incalculably to the facilities for missionary exertion, and will point out with certainty what are the most eligible districts for the erection of new places of worship, that being at present more or less matter of conjecture. But as this undertaking will not only require time and labour, but will involve considerable expense; and as the outlay for printing and circulating gratuitously large numbers of their address has already made serious inroads on their limited funds, allow me to suggest to your readers, and others friendly to the objects we have in view, the propriety of giving us some pecuniary aid. We do not look for large contributions, — sums that, in these days of great Christian liberality, would be reckoned insignificant, would be received by us with thankful acknowledgements, and would enable us to disperse much more widely than we have yet done, our appeal to the friends of Presbytery south of the Tweed, and to enter upon new walks of Christian usefulness. May I hope that this appeal will not be altogether in vain?

We are happy to announce, that arrangements are in progress for meetings and sermons in Birmingham, Derby, Macclesfield, Southampton, York, &c. We understand that Mr. Jaffray had an interview, on Friday last, with the large and influential Committee who attend to the interests of the Free Church in London, at which it was resolved to improve the deep and growing interest in the Free Church which pervades all classes of evangelical Christians, by making arrangements for the reception of a strong deputation in November.

---

The following example of the activity of our friends in England may at once gratify our readers, and encourage all the friends of the Free Church cause. A meeting the expounding our principles, and raising funds in aid of our oppressed and persecuted Church, is to be held in Birmingham, on the 4th of October, when the Mayor is expected to preside. Dr. Cunningham, and other ministers from Scotland, are to address the meeting. Twelve different collections are already promised, for a Sabbath after it is held, "*in decidedly the largest and most important places in Birmingham.*"

The deputation is to continue in that neighbourhood for ten or twelve days, and, aided by the friendly ministers of other denominations, they are to visit, if possible, all the following places, according to arrangements already in course of being made :

West Bromwich.  
Wednesbury.  
Bilston.  
Wolverhampton.  
Walsall.  
Litchfield.  
Dudley.  
Stourbridge.  
Kidderminster.

Bewdly  
Worcester.  
Droitwich.  
Bromsgrove.  
Warwick.  
Leamington.  
Coventry.  
Coleshill.

This may be regarded as only a specimen of what will be done over England immediately after the Assembly. Could we transfer to our columns the urgent letters which reach us from various quarters from day to day, the most timid would cherish hope regarding a cause so befriended. The English are not partizans in reference to our great question. They do not look at our principles through the dust of controversy, but as they are presented to men's notice embodied in great national actions, and a great national Institute, the Free Church. Seen through that medium, they command an immediate, because an instinctive, response in the bosom of every generous man. "I awoke one morning," said Lord Byron, after the publication of *Childe Harold*,—"I awoke one morning, and found myself famous." "I awoke one morning," the Residuary Church may say, "and found myself without people." No doubt, the Establishment and its friends are making violent efforts to persuade themselves that the Free Church is not prospering, and some ridiculous calculations are repeated among them, the result of sheer ignorance, or malice. But by the blessing of God on the endeavours of its friends, that Church will soon be placed beyond the reach both of casualty and persecution. Before principle and truth, every adversary will sooner or later give way.

*To the Editor of the Fife Sentinel.*

*Manchester, Sept. 11, 1843.*

MY DEAR SIR,—I had fondly imagined that my vacation had arrived—that during the weeks of harvest I should enjoy in the bosom of my family undisturbed repose—that the justice bench, the harvest field and domestic duties, would divide my happy hours,—a voice from my home seemed to say,—

"Rest, warrior rest, thou art weary and worn ;  
And fain was their war-broken soldier to stay,—  
But labours returned with the dawning of morn,  
And the voice in my dreaming ear melted away."

A summons from Manchester, the commercial capital of England, called me to join some of our clergymen in forming a deputation to expound our principles in that important city. A number of clergymen and laymen, of all the various denominations of evangelical Non-conformists, had formed themselves into a general Committee to advance our cause. From this influential body the invitation came, and, to obey a call so important, I relinquished, without a sigh, my prospect of ease, and left my resting place.

Nobly, indeed, have we been repaid for our journey. At three consecutive meetings, (each presided over by that eminent and godly citizen, the chief magistrate or mayor of Manchester,) has our cause been pled before, and our appeal been enthusiastically responded to, by the people of Manchester. In the pulpits of 38 churches in this city have our sacred principles been vindicated, and the cause of our suffering Church and suffering people been commended to the Christian sympathy of the English public.

The benefits of this movement are already apparent. Information has been supplied—prejudices have been removed—our principles have been commended to the conviction and judgment of all lovers of gospel truth, and an ardent and still-awakening zeal aroused on our behalf. The seeds of our Protestant principles have been largely sown, and by the blessing of Almighty God, will spring up, bring forth fruits, and spread over ~~far~~ England to her own and our country's benefit.

Upwards of £3,000 have, by means of subscriptions and collections, been already here raised, in aid of our church-building fund. The Mayor, himself a large subscriber, has publicly stated £5,000 as the minimum to which his hopes point for Manchester.

Sir Robert Peel sternly rejected our Claim of Rights, and crushed, as he vainly thought, our cause, lest by concession he should encourage a spirit of religious liberty which might cross the Solway, and come to disturb the Erastian slavery which oppresses, and the hideous corruptions of patronage and trafficking in the souls of men, which weigh like an incubus on the vitality of the Church of England. The shallow politician seems to have taken the very method to secure the very effect he is desirous to avert. Had our question, upon the basis of the Union Treaty, been honestly settled as a Scotch question, the matter might have been hushed up, and the quarrel never, to any effect, have crossed the border.

Oppressed and overborne, we have been compelled, in self-defence, to appeal to the Christian sympathy and aid of England. In the south the interest in our question is daily increasing. We now scarce need to go on a self-suggested errand to England. From almost all quarters of that kingdom we are receiving invitations to come and make public expositions of our cause.

Let the call be responded to. Let fifteen or twenty deputations be sent this very autumn to the most important districts of England. The important effects will be three fold. 1st, It will produce a *large fund* to aid in building churches in our poorer districts. 2nd, It will gather around us and in our support, such an ever-increasing amount of public opinion and influence, as will put down the detestable conspiracy among not a few of our landholders to coerce the consciences of the people, and refuse to sell them standing room on which to worship the God of their fathers according to their conscience. 3d, It will speed onward the cause of Christian union among all evangelical Christians (too much apart hitherto upon sectarian differences), in defence of their common Christianity and common Protestantism, against the combined and rising powers of Erastian, Pusey and Popish intolerance and despotism.

Sir Robert Peel is like the man who, seeking to extinguish a fire, kicked the burning coals about until the entire house was in a flame.

The effects of this movement in Manchester have been truly delightful. The vast bodies of evangelical Non-conformists, the Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, Presbyterians, Evangelical Society of Friends, and not a few evangelical members of the Church of England, have been co-operating in the most brotherly and loving spirit, to an extent never before witnessed. They have done us—they are doing us good; there is truth in

their statements that our suffering Church, in commending her cause to their regard, and bringing all denominations who love Christ into friendly union, are bestowing a benefit upon them.

May the Lord, who bringeth good out of evil, make our conflict productive of increasing benefit to ourselves, and of abundant benefit to this sister kingdom; so that, while England is, in influence and funds, ministering to our necessities in our day of need, she may receive back a blessing an hundred-fold into her bosom.

I hope to write you of our further progress.—I am, Dear Sir, yours faithfully,

D. MAITLAND MACKILL CRICHTON.

We give the following extract from a second letter published by Mr. Mackill Crichton in the *Fife Sentinel*, in reference to the vast importance of following vigorously up the movement so well begun in England:—

“At the period of our departure, the contributions were in Manchester rapidly approaching to £4000; and in Lancashire, the total must be now nearly £7000; a result which, gratifying though it be, is not to be compared in importance to the increasing amount of public influence and support which in the sister kingdom is gathering around our oppressed Church and people.

‘There is a tide in the affairs of men,  
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.  
On such a full sea are we now afloat,  
And we must take the current when it serves,  
Or lose our ventures.’

“The sentiment is emphatically applicable to our present position. If with promptitude and energy we follow up the leadings of Providence, we may be enabled to reach great and glorious results. If now, when the mighty religious movement in Scotland is exciting the admiration of the world—when the memory of our wrongs is yet fresh and green—if now, when the rapid spread of Popery within her Established Church, and the attempts made to oppress Non-conformists, are exciting the jealousy and alarm of Protestant England, we avail ourselves of the vantage ground already gained, and carry our appeal into every important district in England, advantages present and future of the most momentous character will be secured. The pecuniary aid for the outfit and equipment of our Free Church in the poorer districts—although important—will form only a subordinate result. By means of a misinformed and prejudiced English Parliament, Sir Robert Peel and his Cabinet have subverted our Revolution Settlement, and prostrated our national Establishment. By the aid of an enlightened and generous English people, we shall obtain for our Free Church that justice and toleration which the spirit of the British Constitution demands. Who can over estimate the importance of enlisting the Protestantism of the sister kingdom on our behalf? Beset by powerful enemies, who are endeavouring by an underhand but extensive system of cruel persecution, to coerce the consciences of our faithful people, and to drive them from the true Church of their fathers—subjected to a wide-spread conspiracy among our insatuated aristocracy, so as to abuse their rights of property as to trample upon the principles of toleration and the rights of conscience; it seems of the last importance that public opinion, not in Scotland merely, but in England, should wield its mighty, its irresistible authority for our protection.

"Apart from the specialties of our own position, the interests of our common Christianity do at this period, imperatively call for union and co-operation among all the Protestants of the empire. Our cause seems admirably adapted as a rallying point for promoting Christian union. Already in many districts do the several denominations (accustomed to regard each other with no small degree of sectarian jealousy), rejoice to find themselves acting together in a loving and brotherly spirit in support of our suffering Church and people."

#### PUBLIC MEETING AT GRAVESEND.

A crowded and highly respectable meeting was held in the elegant hall of the Philosophical Institution, Gravesend, on Thursday last, —William Hamilton, Esq. in the chair. The meeting was addressed by the Rev. Mr. Jaffray from Edinburgh, the Rev. Messrs. Hamilton, Stewart, and Burns of London, and the Rev. Messrs. Tippetts and Scott of Gravesend. The deepest interest was manifested by the crowded assemblage; and a collection of £30 was made for the Free Church.

#### 3.—MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

**ADHERING SCHOOLMASTER.**—A meeting of all teachers adhering to the Free Church was held on Wednesday last, at 7, North St. Andrew Street, when a series of resolutions, which appear in the advertising columns of to-day's paper, was unanimously adopted. The attendance was numerous, considering how widely the adhering schoolmasters are scattered over the country; and a great number of communications were received from all parts of Scotland, chiefly from parochial teachers. These letters breathe, one and all of them, a spirit of the most unflinching determination to maintain, at all hazards, the principles of the Church of Scotland, as understood and acted on within the Church itself in former times,—the principles which the teachers held and subscribed to when admitted to their offices, and which they still hold, and are resolved to maintain, in connection with the Free Church, such principles being now repudiated by the Erastianized Establishment. Could a few of these communications with propriety be laid before the public, they would exhibit some curious specimens of that bitter hostility to the Free Church which is so prevalent among certain classes, and afford at the same time a proof that intelligence, moral courage, and high principle, which we always knew to prevail among the poorly-remunerated but well-educated schoolmasters of Scotland, and which, we trust, will now more fully attract the attention of those who are ready to acknowledge their worth, and yet apt to overlook them in their obscurity; and will have their effect, as well as other great events of the present day, on those who are slow to acknowledge or appreciate any thing morally or intellectually good or great, unless it be associated with circumstances of prosperity and outward show. The sacrifices which the endowed schoolmasters are prepared to make will be to them as great as those made by the ministers who have given up their status and emoluments, and must secure to them the active support and cordial sympathy of the ministers and members of the Free Church. We are confident that, so soon as the plans of the Education Committee can be fully matured, there will be employment and maintenance for all ad-

hering schoolmasters who may be ejected, as we have no doubt many of them will be, notwithstanding the strong grounds on which their resolutions are founded,—grounds which, though valid, we will venture to say, "*in foro conscientie*," may be but of little avail to them as matters now stand. The schoolmasters will receive more of the public sympathy as their case becomes more fully known; and the endeavour of the Education Committee to find them employment will, we have no doubt, be warmly supported on the part of the public. While the noble men whose names are now ringing through the world have been cheered and comforted by the adherence of the great mass of their countrymen, and are receiving, through the approbation of all evangelical denominations in Christendom, an approval of their past proceedings, and a guarantee for the ultimate and glorious success of their cause, we cannot believe that the schoolmasters who are about to make the same sacrifice, and exhibit the same strength of principle, will be neglected.

**DR. CHALMERS.**—After spending a week on a visit at Banchory House, Aberdeen, where, by his energy and eloquence, he had given a great impetus to the cause of the Free Church, it was announced that he intended to preach at Banchory Devenick on Sabbath last. A large tent had been erected there, close by the new church, capable of containing upwards of 1,500 people. So great, however, was the desire of the people of Aberdeen to hear the venerable Doctor preach, that two hours before the time of meeting, the tent was quite filled, and the whole road for three miles was crowded with persons repairing to the spot. By twelve o'clock a congregation had assembled, variously estimated from six to ten thousand. The space in the neighbourhood of the tent was too limited, and Mr. Thomson of Banchory kindly invited the people to come down and assemble on his lawn. A temporary pulpit was erected at the front-door, round which the congregation gathered, while the hall and several rooms in Banchory House were filled with Mr. Thomson's friends. The Rev. Mr. Archibald conducted the devotional services, and Dr. Chalmers preached for two hours and half from Isaiah xxvii. 4, 5. The discourse contained a full and free proclamation of the gospel, and was characterised by an intimate acquaintance with the human heart. The discourses excited a very deep and solemn impression on the vast audience. The scene was too striking ever to be forgotten by any one who witnessed it.

**PUBLIC BREAKFAST TO DR. CHALMERS.**—On Saturday, 9th current, Dr. Chalmers having accepted an invitation to a public breakfast, between two and three hundred assembled in the Royal Hotel, Aberdeen, to do honour to the most illustrious of Scotchmen. After despatching the greater part of the substantialists that graced the tables, the company had the gratification of listening to their eloquent guest, while expounding his scheme for meeting the demand for new churches,—by each of twelve hundred persons pledging himself to give a half-crown to each new church that should apply for aid. We understand that a subscription was entered into before the Doctor left the room, and now amounts to upwards of £700.

**SUTHERLANDSHIRE—LAIRG.**—On Thursday last, the 31st, the Residuary Presbytery of Dornoch met in the church of Lairy, for the purpose of inducting Mr. Farquhar Mathieson into that parish. There were sixty-three present, besides the Presbytery, the majority of whom were collected from neighbouring parishes. Not one single elder or communicant connected with the parish was present. There is a story among the people, that Mr. Thomas Mackay (great-grandfather of the presentee) had foretold, that the time would come when his kitchen would contain all who



would enter the parish church. This prophecy is in a fair way of being fulfilled. The day before induction, a deputation from the Committee of the Free Church in the parish waited on Mr. Mathieson (late of *Canton*) the liberal Member for Ashburton, asking a site for a church; and not only did he not grant their request, but he was so very liberal as not to see them, or give them any reply, after keeping them for hours standing at his door. While the induction was going in the church, Mr. Gordon, Edderton, and Mr. M'Gillivray, Dairsie, the deputation from the Special Commission of the Free Church, preached to a large and attentive congregation at the tent. Notwithstanding the power of the Duke of Sutherland, and the opiates to conscience which have been administered by another hand, the people of Lairg have acted nobly, placed as they were in the front of the battle, and neither power nor opinion will lead them to forget their resolutions, or to abandon their principles.

**INDUCTION OF MR. DALZIEL AT THURSO.**—A meeting of those who still adhere to the Established Church in this parish took place on Thursday week, at twelve o'clock. Mr. Smith, Bower, preached from Romans, x. 9. After sermon, the preacher, along with a stranger, constituted themselves into a Presbytery, Mr. Jolly of Canisbay, clerk. Mr. Smith stated, that Mr. Dalziel having got a presentation to the parish, had preached in the church three times, and called on the people to sign the call, when seventy individuals adhibited their names. At this stage of the proceedings reasons of dissent were given in, signed by about two hundred persons, against the presentee, chiefly on account of his not understanding the Gaelic language; but Mr. Jolly stated that no reasons would be received unless the objectors were members of the Established Church. This announcement had the effect of novelty, at least, about it, as objections against the morality, &c. of the presentee, might be known to parties who are not in communication with the Establishment. One of the objectors stated, in answer to Mr. Jolly, that he did not attend divine worship elsewhere, that he did not sign of Mr. Taylor, neither did he contribute to the Free Church, nor did he labour free to them. These were the questions generally put by Mr. Jolly, and Messrs. Barnetson and Tait, who were assisting the Presbytery in examining the objectors to the settlement. Mr. Jolly, after consulting with Mr. Smith, repelled the objections, and refused to receive a protest, on the same grounds, viz. the protestor, Mr. Swanson, being a member of another Church. Mr. D. is to be inducted into the cure without delay. He was an Old Light Seceder, but joined the Church of Scotland two or three years ago.—*Abridged from the John O'Groat Journal.* [Does Lord Aberdeen's bill shut out all who are not communicants?] ]

The Residuary Presbytery of Nairn met at Auldearn on Thursday the 21st inst., for the settlement of the Rev. Charles Fowler, presentee to the parish, and a merry meeting they are said to have had. After the settlement, the company dined together. The congregation assembled is said to have been about a hundred, many of whom were from other parishes. One of the few parishioners who attended is said to have just only so far recovered from a fright that he got by an elephant, as to be able to attend. Going out early in a morning, he met Van Amburgh's elephant on his way to Nairn. The man took the elephant for a personage whom it is not right to name. He observed that he was carrying a man, and trembled to think of where! Though himself an adherent of the Establishment, it seems that his conscience was so far from approving, that he at once concluded that it was for going so that this man was where he saw him. Judging that he himself would be the next, as the elephant drew near he

began to cry out, "O, I dinna go to the Kirk; I dinna go to the Kirk." To his unutterable relief, however, the elephant walked past, and left him alone in his glory.

**THURSO, SEPT. 6.**—The building of the Free Churches in this county, with the exception of the parishes of Watten, Keiss, and Berridale, where sites have not yet been procured, is going on well; and, in the roofing of them, slates, I believe, will generally be preferred to felt. The Rev. Mr. Gregory of Edinburgh, and the Rev. Mr. Sutherland of Dumfermline, who were here lately as a deputation from the Special Commission, have been the means of rousing many to redoubled exertions to speed on the good work already begun. After Mr. Gregory had finished a second lecture in Thurso last week, thirty individuals, ladies and gentlemen, heartily responded to a proposal made by our own minister, the Rev. Mr. Taylor, to raise £10 each of additional contributions for the building fund, so as to enable us to build our own church without aid from the central fund. I trust no such aid will be required for the churches either of Thurso or Orlig. Mr. Dalziel, the presentee to this parish, after an absence of one Sabbath, returned, and preached to a much smaller congregation of Moderates than he had at first. There were not above 160 adults present, and *no elder or male communicant* except Sir George Sinclair, the patron (for whom the people here still cherish an earnest regard—though they would like to see him in better company.) and among these, as before, several persons from almost every parish in the county. This was precisely the most unlucky place in all Scotland for Mr. Dalziel to have alighted upon; for having so long observed and appreciated the excellencies and upright and consistent conduct both of the minister and members of the Old Light Secession Church in this town, there is nothing we can less stomach than an apostate Old Light Seceder. The appearance of Sir George's last two letters has caused something of a sensation here. The moderates are quite enraged at them. At Wick, the other day, the presentee to that parish was unceremoniously rejected by the Moderate, on the pretended ground that his voice is too weak. Only one person signed his call; and, at the same time, the above objection was lodged against his settlement,—upon which, fortunately for the Residuaries, he himself came forward and resigned; otherwise he could have been their minister in spite of them as the law now stands, for they could not prove that his voice was insufficient for the small number of hearers he was likely to have there.—*Scottish Guardian*.

**THE FREE CHURCH IN THE NORTH.**—On Tuesday evening a meeting was held in the Old Low Church, Paisley, for the purpose of hearing from the Rev. J. Macnaughtan an account of the state and prospects of the Free Church in Inverness and Nairnshire, which district he had recently visited. Many most interesting details were furnished, from which we glean the following facts: that, with scarcely a single exception, the whole Gaelic population in these districts have left the Establishment, and attached themselves to the Free Church; that in Killearnan parish the whole Presbyterian population, except four or five, have left the Establishment, and there has been only one sermon in the parish church since the disruption. The same statement was made regarding the parishes of Ferintosh, and Moy and Dalarassie. In Kirkhill, it was stated all the Gaelic population were out, and that there had not been a single Gaelic service in the parish church since the disruption; the whole Presbyterian population there had left the Establishment except about twenty. In Kiltarlity, where the minister cleaves to the Establishment, the whole Presbyterian population have come out, except about fifty. In Dorcas

parish, almost the whole body of the communicants have left, and the whole Presbyterian population, except about forty. Similar statements were made regarding the other parishes in that district, so that the Establishment in that part of the island is reduced to a very skeleton. The church was given free, and the audience appeared deeply interested in the address delivered.—*Ibid.*

**FREE PRESBYTERY OF EDINBURGH.**—The following was omitted in our last Presbytery report :—

At the meeting of the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh on Wednesday last, it having been represented to the Court that the Rev. George P. Phillips and the Rev. Mr. Wilson, both probationers of the Free Church, were about to proceed to Malia, the former with a view to a temporary residence, the latter as schoolmaster on the island, it was thought expedient that these gentlemen should be ordained to the office of the eldership, in order that they might constitute a regular session there, in connection with the Rev. John Mackail. They were accordingly solemnly set apart by the Presbytery to the office, the Moderator, Dr. Muirhead of Cramond, presiding. Mr. Phillips and Mr. Wilson afterwards received the right hand of fellowship from the ministers and elders present. The Presbytery also agreed to forward an expression of their deep sympathy to Dr. Kalley, who has been imprisoned in Madeira for preaching to the perishing nations the unsearchable riches of Christ, and also memorialise Government on the subject.

**A CANNY SCOT.**—The Residuary minister of a parish not far from Haddington, lately accosted one of his Free Church parishioners in the usual parlance of the party, "John," said he, "why have ye left my church? Do I not preach the gospel?" "I think I get it fully better preached," said John, quietly. "*whar I gang.*"

**PATENT DRAINS.**—"What's the use of that building?" said a Residuary lately when passing the Free Church at Newington "Do ye see yon Kirk?" said the person addressed, pointing across to Newington old church. "Yes," said the Residuary. "Weel," said the man, "*that's a drain for't.*"

**ROSSKEEN—RIOT.**—With reference to the account of the recent proceedings at the church of Roskeen, which appeared in our last, a correspondent writes.—"The narrative of the proceedings in this parish, copied by you from the *Ross-shire Advertiser*, is a highly coloured and grossly exaggerated account of what took place; and it can only obtain credence from parties at a distance from the spot. From the tenor of the article, one would have naturally looked for a list of killed and wounded at the bottom. Even by their own account, however, there was no injury either to life or limb; the most serious part of the affair appears to have been that, '*Mr. Ross's hat was knocked to atoms.*' It seems strange, too, that when stones and other missiles were flying about at such a rate, all the members of Presbytery, and the concomitant lairds and factors, escaped unhurt. Judging from the rapidity with which their proceedings have since been conducted, (three settlements in a week!) the energies of the former body do not seem to have been in the least impaired. I do not approve of what the people did, but their conduct was anything but very outrageous. They assembled to prevent the occupation of the church by a Residuary Presbytery and presentee; they remained quietly within the walls of the churchyard; their sole aggression was the lowering of the hats of Sir Hugh Fraser and one or two others, who attempted to enter the churchyard, without any personal violence, and giving young Lieutenant M'Leod

a *shake*. A few stones were thrown at the presentee as he retired to Lower Kinneraig, but this was only by some of the more thoughtless, and they hurt nobody. It is right to add, that as it had been hinted through the parish some days before, that some disturbance might take place, the Rev. Mr. Carment took occasion on the Sabbath to warn his people most strongly against any attempt to interfere with the presentee, and it is admitted that his influence with them was the means of preventing what might have been a serious disturbance. By far the greater part of the parishioners remained at home; and the Highland blood of those who did, go kept wonderfully cool.'b

#### THE FATE OF DESERTERS.

*The late appointments to the city Churches.*—*The town Council*—Though silent, we have not been unobservant spectators of the proceedings of the past few weeks on the part of our civic rulers, regarding the vacant churches; and we re-echo the sentiment of a large proportion of the people of Scotland, whether belonging to the Free Church, or the old consistent Moderates, when we say that, as a public body representing public opinion, the Town Council have done themselves honour, as the friends of consistency, in nearly all the appointments. The high-toned language in which some men of all parties among them have spoken of those who conducted and cheered their brethren to the brink of a precipice, helped to throw them over, and then hastened back to seize upon their benefices, must have been felt by some in a way which we need not characterize,—it has been responded to by thousands in a way that indicates intense approbation. "The first of qualifications for a minister of religion," said Mr. Bisset of Bourtie, "is moral consistency;" and though that reverend gentleman and we are rarely on very good terms, we adopt his oracular truism as not unsound. And yet, what has the Government of this land,—what has a crowd of private patrons,—been doing, as if with breathless haste, like men glorying in their shame? They have delighted to honour the men who have cast, not their stipends, but their moral consistency, to the winds,—not their manse and glebes, but their principles, avowed and acted on till within a few days of the testing 18th of May. Anxious to secure a gilding of evangelism, or thinking it enough if they have men in their pulpits who preach the gospel, but who in their public actings do not practice it, the patrons, from Sir James Graham downwards, have actually competed in paying honour to the men who abandoned the principles which they had often asserted in language so strong as to make even the most decided wonder, and abandoned them, too, if not in consequence of the danger and sacrifices to which they led, at least at the very hour when these sacrifices became necessary. There was the coincidence of time, if not the connection of cause and effect; and people *will* suspect; they are very prone to judge even ministers by common worldly maxims. If they see a man deserting his principles just when they begin to demand sacrifices, why, men cannot help concluding,—their moral instincts force them to it,—that the sacrifices were the cause, or at least the occasion, of the change. In the logic of morals, there is no need for premises, copula, and conclusion; the moral sense does the whole, and decides by intuition.

Our civic rulers have acted openly and boldly on this view of public men's conduct. The aspirant successor of the Rev. H. Grey, his former friend,—with Dr. McCulloch, and Johnstone of Auchtermuchty, standing in the front ranks of those who had veered,—have met with such a reception as has shown that wheresoever moral consistency be lacking, it is not, in the present instance, in the Town Council of Edinburgh. Nay, but they have done the first act of public justice that has been done in Scotland to

the principles of the men that are given to change. They had too much eagacity to be deceived by the pretext, so often urged by flimsy religionists, that we must have men who preach the gospel; as if the people of Scotland could be satisfied with a gospel which does not regulate men's conduct. So strong was the moral necessity felt by the Council in their appointments, that one after another abandoned the candidates, when their conduct fairly was made known. In honour of the Town Council, it should never be forgotten that one of those aspirants was actually left without a solitary friend to plead his cause, or if any still lingered on his side, it was rather from pity over the morally fallen, then because they could any longer approve,—it was rather from feelings of compassion towards those who had so completely damaged themselves, than because they had either the hope or the wish that such men should be supported. We repeat, that our rulers have paid a tribute to moral consistency which is not likely to be lost. They did, and they repeated, the first act of public justice to the changers. They may find asylums elsewhere: the Town Council has decided that it shall not be in an Edinburgh pulpit—at present.

It will not be supposed that, in these remarks, we extend any approbation to the principles of the men actually appointed. These we hold to be radically erroneous. We speak only of supporting consistency, and discountenancing the reverse.

DR. CHALMERS.—The Moderator of the General Assembly has returned to Edinburgh from an extensive tour in the north in behalf of the cause to which he has given all his energies. Perth, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, Stonehaven, Arbroath, Dundee, and other places have been visited by him. Feeling that the welfare of Scotland, in the highest sense, depends on the success of the great scheme now carried on by the Free Church, he has given this new proof of his entire devotedness to the great design of establishing it, first, on the basis of sound scriptural principle, and, secondly, in the affections of the adhering people of Scotland. Shall we have a Church in accordance with the Word of God, or opposed to it,—a Church which regulates its actings by the authority of man, or of Him who is anointed King in Zion? Shall the people of Scotland be thrown back full three quarters of a century, and laid helpless again at the feet of Moderatism,—the Upas tree of Christianity, wherever its blighting influence has full scope, —or shall they have a Church from which Moderatism is excluded as far as human power can do so, and in which the gospel of Christ has therefore ample room to develop all its energies? These are the questions which the friends of the Free Church of Scotland are now practically settling; and the experience of a few years will show, nay, it is already manifest where the heart of the kingdom has been during all the years of our past contentings. The visit of the "APOSTLE OF UNION" to the north has largely tended to promote that result. Everywhere, we understand, he was received with the utmost enthusiasm. We are told that, so anxious were people to hear him expound the principles which he has been blessed of God to bring into such prominent place and vigorous operation, he had on some occasions to address five or six different audiences in a day. At Aberdeen the enthusiasm rose so high, that between six and seven hundred pounds were subscribed by a party that met the Doctor at breakfast, and that, too, while all the congregations (we believe *all*) connected with the Free Church in that city are proceeding with the erection of their own fabrics. During the Sabbath of his residence there, the Moderator preached to an assemblage which we have seen variously estimated at from six to eight thousand souls, and that too, although the place of meeting was on a gentleman's lawn, during a Scottish mist, between two and three miles distant from the city. One of the best indications of his success, and of the impulse he has

given to Free Church principles in the north, is the rancorous hostility provoked by its enemies there. We know of no mode of doing justice to their spite, except by quoting against themselves and their creatures their own assaults upon Dr. Chalmers. Altogether we congratulate the Free Church on the success of this tour. He who made it needs not our thanks : his important movements on this occasion may be undervalued by some, but they can be so only when seen in the light of his own past amazing exertions on behalf of that cause in promoting which he has devoted all that God has given him. "Where Thomas Chalmers is, there will the Church of the people of Scotland be."—We would now appeal even to the ultra-Moderatism of Aberdeen, and the whole north, to decide whether Sir George Sinclair was right or wrong in giving forth that prophecy. We trust that our friends in Aberdeen will not let the feeling subside, till it has accomplished the purpose of their visitor.

---

The following is a specimen of some of those holy men, who in humble and private life, do maintain the glory of Christ in the government of His own Church. We have seen, known, loved, revered such men in earlier days ?—the remembrance is still sweet to us ; and therefore we cannot help inserting this obituary-fragment of a man well known before the Throne of God, as one that clave unto Christ, and lived in His cause :—

"Lately, in the village of Hill town of Cadboll, Easter Ross, in the 66th year of his age, ALEXANDER ROSS or MACHOMASH, a remarkable character, well known to many of the more eminent ministers and private Christians in the three counties of Ross, Inverness, and Nairn, for the last forty-five years, as a bold, faithful, uncompromising witness for the truth as it is in Jesus, to the saving knowledge of which he was called in early life, and the doctrines of which he adorned, in a very edifying manner,—all holy conversation and godliness. His love to the Saviour, and pity to our fallen race, were evidenced in the whole tenor of his life, by the most determined stand for the purity of God's revealed word and worship ; by zeal to promote and extend the Redeemer's kingdom everywhere, by the tenderness and faithfulness with which he dealt with individuals under deep soul concern, to many of whom he was indeed a nursing father ; by his unwearied attendance at the sick-bed, and the dying couch ; by his faithful warnings to young and old to prepare for eternity, and by boldly reproofing sin, both in saints and sinners, without regard to those conventional rules by which some think they may permit sin to rest on their neighbours. This no doubt caused him to have some more enemies in the world, but he had the testimony of a good conscience to support him. He was eminently a man of prayer. Placed, in the providence of God, in the very humble, laborious, and often-precarious, calling of a fisherman, he managed, by the blessing of God, on his great industry, prudence, and integrity, to rear up a large family in great independence and comfort, without ever allowing his worldly affairs to interfere with the most regular attendance on the means of grace, public and private, to many of which his boat afforded him ready access at great distances, and by which he became so extensively known to the faithful in the north. It was on sacramental occasions, when called on to speak to a question, "in the great congregation," that the depth of his understanding in the mysteries of the kingdom of God, and the fervid eloquence of his tongue, proceeding from a sanctified heart, were felt and appreciated by kindred spirits. There was, at the same time, a gentleness and social cheerfulness about him, that made him a favourite even with some that knew not the true spring from whence it flowed. His education extended only to the reading of his Bible, or some

plain authors ; but he was mighty in the Scriptures, and in wielding the sword of the Spirit, with intelligent application, he had few equals in his day. So much excellence of character could not be expected to pass through life without trials, and he had many of them, and his last illness was severe and protracted ; but "patient in tribulation," and "joyful in hope," he overcame all by the Word of God, and by looking unto Jesus. Much solemn warning and council did he give to the ministers and people of God who visited him on his death-bed, against the seducing spirits and false appearance that are manifesting themselves in our day, leading many away from the simplicity that is in Christ ; and it was most interesting to attend to the views and feelings he had in regard to the great struggle in which the majority of the Church of Scotland was engaged for years back, in contending for the Crown-rights of the glorious Redeemer, and the privileges of his faithful followers. The joy he felt when told of any thing that tended to promote and secure the great principles so dear to him from his youth, and the indignation he felt at the unscriptural arguments and unworthy means used by the Moderates in support of a bad cause ; and then he would dwell with delight on the memory of the great and good ministers under whose preaching his soul used to feed on the bread and the water of life in his younger days, such as Calder of Ferrintosh, Mackay of Moy, Bayne of Kiltarlity, M'Adam of Nigg, Stewart of Dingwall, Mackintosh of Tain, Forbes of Tarbet, &c. &c., who were all to him and others as stars of the first magnitude in the spiritual firmament in their day. The writer of this notice was privileged to know the deceased intimately for the last nine years, and he can truly say, that a more complete development of the Christian character, in all the fruits of the spirit, he has not yet met with. The loss of such a man, and at such a time, is great cause of mourning to all the real friends of Christ in Ross-shire, and they may well say of him, what King David said of Abner in the typical Israel, that a prince and a great man has fallen among them."

#### A FALSE CHARGE.

On Tuesday, the 5th current, Mr. Sheriff Barclay held a Criminal Court for the trial of summary complaints at the instance of the Joint Procurators-Fiscal of Court. The first case called was that of William Suttie, farm-servant at Gallowmuir ; Robert Marshall at Mountstewart ; and Walter Smith at Westhall—accused of having "all and each, or one or more of them, been guilty of the crime of theft, actors or actor, or art and part—in so far as, on the 17th day of July last, or about that time, they did all and each, or one or more of them, from or near that part of the farm of Mains of Aberdalgie, situated on the south side of the river Earn, in the occupancy of John Tod, farmer there, *wickedly and feloniously STEAL, and theftuously* away take, fifteen or twenty cart-loads of sand or gravel, the property, or in the lawful possession of the said John Tod, or of the Right Hon. the Earl of Kiinnoul." The panels pleaded not guilty to the charge of theft. The panels had previously undergone the ordeal of a judicial examination before the Sheriff, and there they had stated that they had been instructed by their respective masters to drive sand for the Free Church to be built at Forgandenny, and that they had accordingly driven sand from the place libelled by direction of the contractor. From the proof led, it was established that the Free Church congregation at Forgandenny had resolved to build a place of worship for themselves at Forgan ; that some of the farmers belonging to the congregation had agreed to perform the carriage connected with the building ; and that the panels, who were servants with these farmers, were employed in driving sand for the church from the bed of the river Earn, under instructions received from them and from the contractor.

It was then, under these admitted circumstances, that the panels were charged with the crime of *feloniously stealing* and theftuously taking away the sand from the river Earn; and if the panels had not been able to have clearly established a *right* to take the sand, no such plea as that they were acting under the directions of their masters could have availed them. No, they must have left the bar branded as thieves, because there is no mandate in crime, and because, forsooth, they ought to have known whether their masters had right or liberty to take a cart-load of sand from the bed of a river! And observe the consequences of a refusal: they might have been dismissed upon the spot, and thus have forfeited their whole year's wages—hardly earned. Fortunately, however, they were able to prove—and they did prove most satisfactorily—that they had a right to take the sand in question; nay more, that the whole people in the district have a prescriptive right of taking sand and gravel from the place libelled. They established in the clearest manner, that, for a period beyond the memory of man, sand and gravel, for various purposes, had been taken from the bed of the river Earn, at the same place as that from which they took it, by all and sundry in the district. This was proved by various individuals, aged from sixty up to seventy-five years, who had been engaged in taking sand and gravel themselves, and who had seen others do so without any challenge whatever; and the same practice was proved to have continued down to within a month of the trial. Even Mr. Tod, the tenant, a witness for the prosecution, was obliged to admit that he had never before challenged any person; and Mr. Lorimer, factor to Lord Kingoull, also a witness for the prosecution, admitted that he himself had frequently taken sand from the same place without asking permission from the tenant. It was also proved that the practice which had thus prevailed was so notorious as to be known to almost every individual in the district. The contractor for the Free Church of Forgan was some short time ago contractor for building a new manse at Forgandenny, and from this very spot he took the sand used in building the manse without any challenge whatsoever.

But in the face of all this evidence, one of the Fiscals still maintained that he was entitled to a conviction of *theft* against the whole panels, and that the evidence adduced by them went merely to extenuate or mitigate the offence. The Sheriff, however, after hearing a very able argument from Mr. Reid for the panels, was of a different opinion, and found the panels, not guilty, and dismissed them *simpliciter* from the bar. We cannot, however, well conceive the grounds upon which the worthy Sheriff refused expenses to the panels—he stated none—for, as was justly observed by their agent, the Public Prosecutor might, by a very little inquiry, have easily discovered that there was no case against them, and thus have saved them the expense of defending themselves.

This is a case upon which we can scarcely venture to make any remarks. It is most unfortunate, certainly, that the first challenge of a right which was established to have been enjoyed by the people of Strathearn for upwards of half-a-century, should have been in the shape of a charge so serious as that of theft. Some people will be malicious enough to insinuate, and even to allege, that the charge was, in its origin, although, of course, not in so far as the Public Prosecutors were concerned, a thrust at the Free Church. This we can hardly believe. If, however, it was so intended, it has met with the fate it deserved. But be this as it may, we cannot altogether acquit the Public Prosecutors of some degree of blame. We are quite aware that it is frequently difficult, and sometimes even impossible, to obtain convictions against parties who are really guilty; but this is not one of those cases. Here, it is evident, a very little of that industry and perseverance which are so frequently displayed by them for the public interest in order to convict the



guilty, would have at once discovered, for the public interest, that these parties were innocent, and thus the public money, and also the means of these poor farm-servants, would have been saved. It appears to us that the Public Prosecutors should, at all events, have at once abandoned the case upon hearing the evidence that was adduced by the panels.

#### UNION FOR PRAYER.

The October number of the *Presbyterian Review*, which is just out, contains some excellent remarks on this interesting subject. We subjoin them. The deliverance of last Assembly was as follows: "The Assembly having heard and considered the overture relative to a proposed concert or union for prayer, similar to what was so cordially responded to during the two last years, have to suggest, that the time from Saturday the 2d to Monday the 11th days of December next (both inclusive) be the period of the concert, and earnestly recommend the subject to the consideration of the ministers, elders, and members of this Church." If our friends in Glasgow are not to publish any address this year, we would venture to suggest that the remarks in the *Review* be published separately, in the form of a tract, and widely circulated.

UNION FOR PRAYER.\*—Our readers would observe from our last number, that there is to be another union for prayer, during the ten days commencing with Saturday the 2d of December next. We trust that measures will be taken to make this proposal known as extensively as possible, in order that it may be responded to by Christians of every Church and every clime throughout the world. We would urge our readers not merely to remember this proposal themselves, but to do every thing in their power for making it extensively known. Especially we would request ministers of every denomination under whose notice these lines may come, to take means for announcing it to their people some considerable time beforehand, and preparing them for engaging in it when the period arrives. The first year it was more extensively made known, and a very deep interest taken in it even by many of the careless and worldly, who, though they might not relish its exercises, were yet struck and startled by its occurrence. Last year there was not such an extensive announcement of it, nor such pains taken to awaken an interest in it. Hence it was not so universally observed, nor did it impress the public so deeply. We trust, however, that this third proposal may be cordially and universally responded to by all who name the name of Christ, not only in Great Britain, but throughout the world.

Truly we need to pray! In these prayerless days we need to be stirred up to prayer! We need to learn what it is to pray in faith, and what it is to pray without ceasing.

I. OUR DUTY. Pray without ceasing, (1 Thess. v. 17.) Men ought always to pray and not to faint, (Luke xviii. 1.) Few Christians remember the *command* thus laid on them to continue instant in prayer. They acknowledge the privilege, but overlook the duty. Hence they do not consider the *sin* of neglecting prayer. Yet who can calculate the weight of guilt at this moment lying on the Churches of Christ as well as on private Christians,

\* It is agreed that during the ten days, commencing with Saturday the 2d of December, and concluding with Monday the 11th, the hour between eight and nine in the morning, and eight and nine in the evening, or as near that as possible, shall be devoted to secret prayer, the former of the two Saturdays being more especially set apart as a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer; the latter of the two Mondays appropriated to thanksgiving and praise.

for not praying without ceasing? Hours, weeks, months, wasted in folly, indolence, sleep, company, idle visiting, frivolous conversation, unprofitable reading, useless occupations, that might have been redeemed for prayer! What is half an hour, what is an hour each morning and evening? What is this to Luther's three hours, or John Welsh's eight? Lord, teach us to pray!

II. OUR NEED OF PRAYER. Oh, what need! Words cannot set forth its greatness; nor would a life time suffice to declare our manifold wants. One single glance within, upon our own famine-stricken souls, or without upon churches in which the things that remain are ready to die, or abroad upon a world lying in wickedness, and given over to the evil one, would be enough to overwhelm us with the scene of "lamentation, and mourning, and woe." What need to pray!

(1.) *Spiritual life is low*, (Rev. iii. 1.) Compared with the warmth of other days, it can scarcely be called life at all. We have left our first love, (Rev. ii. 4.) We have become lukewarm, neither cold nor hot, (Rev. iii. 16.) Living religion is a lean and spectral shade. Zeal evaporates in form and bustle. Faith is languishing, and love is fallen into the sere and yellow leaf. What need of quickening! What need of vital warmth,—a warmth not produced by the mere friction of excitement, but glowing and fresh from the altar above.—the warmth of souls baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire.

(2.) *We make little progress*. Ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, (2 Tim. iii. 7; Heb. v. 12.) In the mighty business of advancing in the Christian course, of growing in grace, we seem, alas, to dream. Five, ten, twenty, forty years fly on, and we seem only at the point whence we started when first we believed! Our light is not brightening, our holiness is not deepening, our graces are not ripening! What a feeble, famished band of worn-out Christians are we! Neither growing ourselves, nor helping others to grow! Oh, what need to pray!

(3.) *There is much inconsistency*. Our light does not shine before men, (Matt. v. 14,—16.) It is hidden and clouded. At the best, it has more of the red blaze of the meteor, than the fresh, glad radiance of the morning-star. Christ expects us to be his representatives on earth; "as he was, so are we to be in this world." Yet we are not. The mirror is not merely soiled and dim, but marred and broken, reflecting the world more than Jesus, from its thousand fragments. We have little of the mind of Christ, (Phil. ii. 1—5.) We are not self-denied, solemn, humble, lowly, gentle, loving; but full of self, pride, levity, malice, and envy. Miserable representatives of the altogether perfect One! Sad, shaded, mis-shapen likenesses of the altogether lovely one! Through us his name is blasphemed, and his gospel hindered! (Ezek. xxxvi. 20.) Oh, what need to pray!

(4.) *There is little power in the ministry*. Of Luther it was said, "each word of thine was a thunderbolt." Of Venn we are told, that when he preached, "men fell before him like slaked lime." Baxter tells us, that he had reason to believe that he never preached one sermon in vain. How different now! Our sermons fall pointless and powerless. Consciences are not pricked, hearts are not broken, souls are not saved! The sleepers awake not, the dead arise not, the dark world remains a dark region still. The dry bones still lie whitening along the valley, unquickenied and unshaken! What a palsied ministry is even that of those who have been most blest in our day! Where are the pentecostal sermons, where the pentecostal shower? What desolate parishes, what lifeless congregations appal the eye and sadden the believing soul! Oh, what need to pray! (Hos. x. 1—12; Zech. x. 1.—3.)

(5.) *Disunion prevails.* Instead of being one, the Churches of Christ are rent in a thousand pieces. Instead of being bound together in loving union, Christians keep far asunder, and allow their love toward each other to be chilled. The cement of charity which binds souls together being removed, the whole body crumbles into fragments. Unity cannot subsist when love has fled. What dishonour on the name of Jesus does this disunion bring! It seems as if he had prayed in vain, (Jhon xvii. 20—23.) Sad, strange spectacle to a scoffing world for these eighteen hundred years! Oh, what need to pray!

(6.) *Wickedness abounds.* What are our large cities but sinks of iniquity, and what are our country parishes, even at the best, but so many barren wastes? The enemy has come in like a flood. Error multiplies. Superstition spreads itself. Infidelity is leavening the multitude. Licentiousness pours itself out like a flood. Ungodliness covers the land. The efforts of Christians to arrest the torrent, or dry up its waters are unavailing. Perilous times have come. The shadows of the world's evening are stretched out. The earth is defiled under the inhabitants thereof. (Isa. xxiv. 5.) Oh, what need to pray!

III. THE ADVANTAGES OF SUCH A UNION. It would unite all real believers, removing the many interposing barriers of separation, and drawing them into one. It would kindle love to each other among God's people of every Church and clime. It would tend to separate us from the world. It would present a solemn spectacle to the world. It would fix our hearts upon the obtaining of the promised blessings. It would awaken in us a more fervent spirit of prayer, and make us alive to the necessity of praying more. It would honour God's ordinance of prayer, and Christ's special promise regarding agreement in prayer. It would draw down the blessing from above, so that in answer to our united cries, we should have the Holy Spirit of promise poured largely down on us, to gather out a people prepared for the Lord. What might we not expect for ourselves, for our land, our cities, our congregations, the world in which we live? Who can calculate the blessed, the infinite, the eternal results of such a union in prayer?

IV. THE MANNER IN WHICH IT IS TO BE DONE. The experience of former years will suggest many profitable hints on this point, teaching us the necessity of looking forward to and preparing for it, that when it arrives every thing may be done decently and in order.

(1.) Each Christian should endeavour to set apart as much of the proposed time as possible for private prayer. It is one of the chief ends of this concert to send each individual to his closet, and to summon them to more fixed earnestness of soul in resting with the prayer-hearing, promise-keeping God.

(2.) Besides directing the minds of the household to the objects of the prayer union at family worship, temporary prayer-meetings might be formed among Christians, who may have it in their power to meet with each other. This would tend greatly to promote union in prayer, and help forward the design of the concert.

(3.) There should be public congregational meetings during the whole period. These ought to be frequent; once each day would not be too often in most cases. This, however, must be left to the judgment of each minister. These public meetings ought by no means to trench upon the hour set apart for private prayer.

**LORD, TEACH US TO PRAY!**

Passages for our warrant and encouragement,—Deut. iv. 29-31; Hos. xii. 3-6; Zech. x. 1; Mal. iii. 16; Matt. xviii. 19; Mark xi. 22-24; John xiv. 13, 14; Rom. viii. 26.

## V.—FOREIGN AND MISSIONARY CORRESPONDENCE OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

(*From the Free Edinburgh Church Record.*)

1.—Mr Nesbit's communication is particularly important, as showing the confidence with which our brethren are prepared to appeal to our countrymen in India, and to the friends of missions generally. The combined exertions of the missionaries will doubtless go far to meet the exigencies of the crisis; but we must never forget that upon us devolves the highest responsibility, and that every member of our Free Church must be taught to regard it as an indispensable duty to continue and extend those gospel advantages which have already been owned of God, for the advancement of His cause among the perishing heathens.

Mr. Nesbit states the encouraging fact, that the large sum offered for the Establishment of a mission for Central India remains unappropriated. Nagpore should have been occupied ere now. Let us hope that its claims will be speedily and energetically acknowledged.

EXTRACT LETTER FROM REV. ROBERT NESBIT, TO REV. CHARLES J. BROWN,  
CONVENER OF PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE.

*Bombay, June 16, 1843.*

MY DEAR SIR.—I had already expressed to Dr. Welsh and Gordon my own feeling and purposes in connection with the impending crisis of the Church; my brethren here and at Puna had done the same: and we were anxiously waiting to receive a proposal or a response from you, when your welcome letter came to hand. From public speeches we had gathered your general views and wishes on the subject of the India Mission,—from private sources our hopes were confirmed; but still something more certain and definite was earnestly desired. You will readily conceive, therefore, what a relief your communication proved, and what a sense of satisfaction it still diffuses over our minds. Had not you taken us up, we should have been obliged to cast ourselves on the liberality of individuals in India and in Britain, or to put ourselves under the patronage, if it would willingly afford it, of the London Missionary Society, whose original principles are sufficiently general to embrace a Presbyterian mission. But we have already felt too much of the comfort and security, and enjoyed too much of the benefit, of a proper ecclesiastical connection between a mission and the Church which supports and superintends it, to contemplate such an arrangement with any thing like satisfaction or joy. And now, that it appears to be the will of the Church's great Head thoroughly to "purify and make her white," our attachment grows into a love ardent and unquenchable. We begin to feel a confidence before unknown; and that confidence both establishes our hearts and quickens our zeal. Your poverty, although it tries, does not alarm us; for we remember who hath said, "I know thy poverty; but thou art rich." The Church of Scotland has been "rich" in prayer, and power, and fruitfulness,—"rich" in Israel's holy vehemence, and in blessings from the hand of Him who desires by that vehemence to be overcome,—"rich" in all the warnings of the law and invitations of the gospel,—"rich" in all wisdom and utterance, both towards saint and sinner. She has been so; and we cannot look back on

such periods without a joyful hope mingling with our sorrowful regrets. Why may she not again be what she once was? Scotland is now living on the deep and pervasive piety of bygone ages. Why may not her population become as generally and deeply devout as before? May the Lord support your evangelistic zeal! May you complete many successful "campaigns," as good and hardy soldiers of the Lord Jesus Christ! May the great Conqueror himself "subdue the people under you!" May Christ reign in all the families, and communities, and institutions of our beloved land! Above all, may He pour out upon you, and ever maintain within you, the Spirit of grace and supplication!—the Spirit of Jehovah's remembrances, who keep not silence, and give him to rest, until he arise and make Jerusalem a praise in the earth! The Lord will then pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it. It will overflow all former bounds, and its overflowings shall reach even unto us.

It appears to us that, in undertaking to support your missions in India as before, you do not attempt any thing like an impossibility. The good people of Scotland, though called upon to give for the gospel at home to an extent hitherto unexampled, will not cease, on that account, to make donations as formerly to the objects of propagating the gospel abroad. These donations will almost all come to you, and will be available for the purpose for which they are given. If, indeed, you find success in widening the sphere of liberality, especially from below, to the extent you anticipate, you will, with much smaller donations than formerly, have a much larger amount on the whole. Your pence, and the missionaries' farthings, will amply supply both you and them. You may rest assured that we will not neglect to use every endeavour to obtain aid more extensively than ever from our friends in India. As soon as the disruption, which we dare hardly hope has not already taken place, becomes known to us, we will publish the new relations and altered circumstances in which we are placed, and shall, I doubt not, find a readier, and freer, and fuller response to our appeals than we have yet done, not only from sound-hearted Presbyterians, but also from all pious Episcopalians and Independents. I may here mention, that an honest Scotch captain of a ship sent me £2, 14s. the other day, "for the Non-Intrusion party in the Church of Scotland."

It is perhaps well for us that we do not enjoy the presence of Dr. Wilson at a season requiring more than ordinary practical wisdom and energy; for he is probably more needed at home, and will better subserve the interests of the mission there.

The Institution, I fear, we shall not be able to retain. "Doctors Stevenson and Wilson hold the premises in trust for the mission at Bombay of the Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts,—to be dealt with and disposed of in such manner as the said Dr. Wilson, Dr. Stevenson, jointly with the Rev. R. Nesbit, the Rev. J. M. Mitchell, and other missionaries at Bombay for the time being of the said General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and the Rev. G. Cook, and other Presbyterian chaplains at Bombay for the time being, and the Rev. A. Brunton, or other convener for the time being, and the Rev. R. Gordon, or other secretary for the time being of the said Committee, shall from time to time agree." I have not seen the trust-deed; but the above is the report of our excellent attorney on the subject. It is well that the large sum offered for the mission at Nagpore is still pending, as I believe it is. We may, I understand, still carry out the wishes of the donor with respect to it. Sad it is that so much valuable property should fall into the hands of those for whom it was never designed. But faith listens to the ancient narrative, and stills and stays the mind: "What

shall we do for the hundred talents which I have given to the army of Israel? And the man of God answered, Jehovah is able to give thee much more than this."—I am &c.

## 2.—POONAH.

The brethren at Poonah concur with their friends at Bombay. We shall not trench upon our limited space by any remarks, but simply give the letters of Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Aitken.

---

EXTRACT LETTER FROM REV. J. MITCHELL TO THE REV. C. J. BROWN,  
CONVENER OF PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE.

*Puna, June 16, 1843.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—It is with much satisfaction that I perused your letter of the 2d May, together with Dr. Chalmers' postscript, on the part of the Provisional Committee of ministers and elders named by the conviction of ministers in November last, and a meeting of elders held subsequently, addressed to me as senior missionary, to be communicated to the brethren in the mission.

I am fully determined to go along with the Non-Intrusion party, and am therefore thankful to the Lord who hath put such carefulness into your hearts in reference to His cause in these quarters. I had no expectation of such communications as this from home; yet feeling that, in case of a disruption of the Establishment, I could not remain in connection with the party who would cling to the Government Church,—men with whom I never had any sympathy,—I, by last month's steamer, stated to Dr. Brunton my views on the subject. Nothing could, then, be more gratifying to my mind, or appear more evidently an answer to prayer, than the assurance contained in your letter, "that it will be one of the chief objects of the Church, when disestablished, to maintain the present missions to the Jews and Gentiles." With this assurance I rest fully satisfied, and feel no doubt that our gracious God will supply whatever is necessary for the support of the Church, both at home and abroad, and for enabling you greatly to strengthen and extend the mission: "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." The prospect may be dark, but the promises of God stand sure; they declare that "what is good the Lord will give; that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

I have shown your letter to my colleague, Mr. Aitken, who fully participates in the feelings which I have expressed. He has written himself fully on the subject to Dr. Candlish. I sent it also to the brethren in Bombay, Messrs. Nesbit and Murray Mitchell, and, as was to be expected, find that they are decidedly on the right side. Mr. Nesbit, in returning the letter, says "We have both expressed our purpose to Dr. Gordon with respect to separation from the Erastian party. The document from home (your letter) is excellent, and just what we could have wished. Deep gratitude is loudly called for. Who of the missionaries will not adhere."

I am sure that our connecting ourselves with the Free Church will be fully approved of by the religious community in India, and that we shall

be as fully supported by them as heretofore. Moderation is in no favour with the goldy here more than at home. \* \* \*. We have always had a considerable congregation of our own countrymen at this station, Poona, composed of Presbyterians, and pious people of the English Church. We have a regular session, who are all strong Non-Intrusionists.

I will not now enter on the state and prospects of the mission; but will (D. v.) write you fully on the subject next month, should we have heard of the sad event to which we are looking forward,—the separation of the parties in the Establishment into two Churches.—Believe me, &c.

JNO. MITCHELL, Missionary.

#### LETTER FROM MR. JAMES AITKEN TO THE REV. DR. CANDLISH.

Poonah, June 17, 1843.

MY DEAR DR. CANDLISH.—By this time you have, in all probability, ceased to be a minister of the Established Church of Scotland, and have been made one of the honoured instruments for setting in order the affairs of a church privileged to make the most glorious protest that has ever been made against the adverse principle *within* the pale of the visible Church. Surely the sifting process that has been accomplished, must tend to promote the *real* interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. I feel much satisfaction at the prospect of being connected with a Church so thoroughly purged from the leaven of Erastianism; and more sanguine than heretofore, that a blessing will attend our labours among the heathen. Yet I cannot but look upon what has taken place as only a beginning of tribulations, in which the patience and faith of the saints may be more severely tested than in any preceding era of the Church's history. And if judgment begin at the *house of God*, what shall the end be of *them* that obey not the gospel?

Mr. Mitchell has shown me a letter he received by last mail from Mr. Brown and Dr. Chalmers, stating, that in the event of a separation of the Evangelical party from the State, they will take under their charge such of the missionaries as may adhere to them, and that they hope to be able to carry on the mission as heretofore. For this we are thankful. But for myself I may say (and my brethren are of the same mind), that no worldly consideration whatever could induce me to have any connection with the party that may remain attached to the State. It is most satisfactory to the believer to have the path of duty so clear and well defined as in the present case. In walking in it, there is no hindrance to the joy of faith in leaving consequences entirely with Him to whom they belong.

We are unfortunate here in not having the sympathies of our Christian friends, on the rational ground of a clear and sound apprehension of the grand principle for which such sacrifices are made. This would perhaps be too much to expect from those who have been reared in Episcopacy. They do, however, most cordially sympathize with us, from their entertaining the belief that, to use their own words, "it is the children of God who are going out, and the other party who are remaining."

Our work is proceeding as usual. The Marathi schools are flourishing, and the English Institution has recovered from the effects produced by the admission of the Parmaree boy. But this season we have unfortunately lost all our more advanced pupils, except one. They have got situations in the public offices, and have, consequently, left the school. This is an evil altogether inevitable in the present state of things. We must lay our account with having to go over and over again the same

beaten track. But it is consolatory to reflect, that those who thus leave us carry with them the seed of eternal life, which the Spirit of grace may, at any time, cause to spring up and bring forth fruit.—Believe me, &c.

JAMES AITKEN.

Such is the united testimony of the missionaries at Bombay and Poonah. Its moral effect must be great in the East; but its beneficial influence will be felt extensively here. The praise of the men, from whom it proceeds, is in all the churches. Their abundant labours, their holy zeal, their Christian usefulness, are admitted by all. Let us acknowledge, with adoring gratitude, the Lord's goodness to us and to them; and be more than ever exercised at the throne of grace, that the Spirit may be poured forth upon them from on High; and that we may have to rejoice with them, because of the triumphant progress of the blessed gospel among the people, for whose eternal benefit they have sacrificed all that man counts dear.

#### CALCUTTA AND MADEAS.

We are without despatches from these more distant stations. Indeed we could not reasonably have expected hitherto the satisfaction of hearing from the missionaries. By next mail, however, we may have letters from some of them. At all events, the succeeding post will bring us important communications.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MINISTER AND TEACHER TO MALTA.

The Ladies' Colonial Association who formerly sent out the Rev. J. J. Wood to this island, have, in concert with the Colonial Committee, appointed the Rev. John Mackail, late of Gretna, to be minister of the Scotch Church, Malta. From his experience, piety, and devotedness, we hope great things, through the blessing of God resting upon his labours.

They have also appointed the Rev. George Wilson, parochial schoolmaster, Alves, to proceed to Malta in the capacity of teacher. Mr. Wilson has attained to high distinction in his profession, and his appointment will greatly strengthen our infant Church, and confer the greatest benefits upon the children of our countrymen there.

The Free Presbytery of Edinburgh meets for Mr. Mackail's ordination to-day, and he and Mr. Wilson will proceed immediately to the sphere of their future labours.

#### EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM MR. WINGATE JEWISH MISSIONARY AT PESTH.

*Hungary, July, 1843.*

I have just finished five numbers of the "Witness," with a full account of what the Lord has been doing with the beloved Church of Scotland. We see, in the unanimity, firmness, zeal and love vouchsafed to her, the out-poured Spirit of God, who comes down as the dew upon Israel, in answer to the unwearied supplication (of all who know the Lord), that God might glorify his holy name in this trying crisis. How may we bless and thank the Lord, that she had never been permitted to accept any "State plasters for her sores," but that the Lord kept her in the furnace, anxiously looking for some tokens that the gold in her should reflect his image. The Church of Scotland never looked so like the Church of Scotland since her Confession



and Standards were compiled. Let us take it as a token for good, that the Lord has the glorious work for her of carrying the gospel to his ancient people, and together with all who love the Lord Jesus throughout this little earth, she may exhibit the marks of the Church in which the Lord will speedily bring all the kingdoms of the earth to call him blessed, when the kings and potentates shall no longer plot against the Lord and his Anointed, but their reason shall return to them, and they shall bless the Most High, and praise and honour him that liveth for ever and ever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation. The impression after reading the whole proceedings—*deeply engraven* on my mind—is, never has so large a portion of the visible Church exhibited the marks of Christ's Church so clearly and distinctly; the growth in patience, calmness, love, humility, self-denial, zeal for the glory of God filled my soul with praise to God. May the Spirit of God be so poured out on the Church of Scotland that all her ministers may see eye to eye, and give themselves, soul and body, to the service of Him who alone can purify the sons of Levi, and order and fashion his beautiful house after his holy Word, in all things. Oh, what need of humbling of soul before God—of confession of the sins of nation and Church! Then will the Lord return indeed to Zion. The Lord open the eyes of the "Residuary," and either make them "witnesses for the truth," or in some other way overrule present evil for his glory. Their troubles are, as it were, beginning. If our sufferings abound, our consolations shall much *more* abound, so that we shall say, "our light afflictions, which are but for a moment, shall work out for us a far more exceeding, even an eternal weight of glory." When Christian, in the "Pilgrim's Progress," got a sight of the *cross*, his burden fell off; and so may we say of the good Church of our fathers,—the sight of the *Cross* took away her burden internal and external—moderation and patronage; and now shall we walk free, and shall look forward and pray for the day when England, Scotland, and Ireland, shall be found *covenanting* with the Lord God of hosts, King of kings, and Lord of lords, seeking grace as a nation, both to offer willingly of silver and gold which are the Lord's, and of which we are but the stewards, and solemnly declaring, that Christ and Christ alone must rule in his own house. Then the Church in her place, and the State in her place, will be fulfilling to the glory of God, in mutual peace and love, the duties which, as the divinely instituted ordinances of God, severally belong to them. The Lord hasten it in his own time.

The effects of this testimony will be great throughout Christendom, and I earnestly hope it will be followed by a deputation of some of our most pious ministers and elders to America, Europe, and throughout the whole Christian world, to confer, cheer, and inform one another on the nature of the great principles which are agitating the Church and the world. I am persuaded it would be for the glory of God, and the salvation of multitudes of souls, that such a deputation were "*always out peregrinating*;" it would cost a little money, but it would be a great blessing, and the Lord will give the money.

### 3.—BEYROUT.

The following letter of adherence has been received from our missionary in Syria.

LETTER FROM REV. WILLIAM O. ALLAN TO REV. DR. CHALMERS.

*Beyrout, July 10, 1843.*

VERY REVEREND SIR,—By this same post I transmitted to the Presbytery of Hamilton, by whom I was ordained, the demission of my status as a

member and minister of the Church of Scotland as now by law recognised. My reasons for doing so are in substance as follows:—Because the civil magistrate has interfered, in the government of Christ's Church, to an unwarranted and prohibited extent; and because the Church, in her so called General Assembly of 1843, has not resisted, but admitted and sanctioned such unwarranted and prohibited interference.

And now, believing that the "Free Presbyterian Church" does recognise and maintain the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, as alone to be regarded in the administration of the government of His house, as well by the civil magistrate in those things about which he is bound to take order, as by the Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate, in those things in and about which they alone are to administer the government of the Church: And understanding that this "Free Presbyterian Church" will always and stedfastly maintain the duty of the civil power to submit to the authority of Christ, and acknowledge His supremacy, by having respect to His law in all civil enactments, and particularly by establishing and maintaining a public form of worship according to His will declared in the New Testament: And that, in the administering of the government of this Church, the privileges and responsibilities of Christ's people shall be recognised and maintained according to the mind and will of Christ, these privileges and responsibilities being unaffected by any power extraneous to the Church, whether that power be in the hands of member or non-members of the Church: I do, with all due deference to the judgment of my fathers and brethren in interpreting and applying the law of the New Testament in these matters—that law being the only standard admitted—hereby intimate my adherence to the "Free Presbyterian Church," desiring to be received into that communion according to appointed form.

Begging to be excused for the liberty I have taken in making such statements, as also indulgence for the imperfection of them,—I am, &c.,

WILLIAM OWEN ALLAN,  
*Missionary to the Jews in Syria.*

---

JASSY.

Mr. Edward is still at Constantinople, but is about returning to Jassy. His letter contains a warm expression of devotedness to the Free Church. A similar adherence has reached us from Mr. Herrman Philip.

LETTERS FROM REV. DANIEL EDWARD TO J. G. WOOD, ESQ.

*Constantinople, July 4, 1843.*

MY DEAR SIR,—I desire most heartily to respond to yours of the 3d June, in which you invited me to labour in the Jewish field in connection with the Committee of Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. My opinion was already formed upon the same grounds on which the ministers at home saw it to be the line of duty to take the step they did. But it has been with no little emotion we have heard of the visible approbation which the Lord vouchsafed to his servants, pouring out his Holy Spirit—a Spirit of peace, and love, and comfort, and wisdom, and of a sound mind—so largely upon all who were called upon to take part in your doings. My dear Sir, the influence has been deeply felt, and called forth abundant thanksgivings among all Christians in these parts. For myself, I have been filled with adoration and praise that the Lord should have lifted himself in our day so to visit His people; and my continual prayer is, that you may be enabled to uphold faithfully the good testimony which you were strengthened to make.

I am encouraged to hope that the Lord will soon look down upon us also, for the times are manifestly in His hand. We cannot express to you how refreshing and animating the account of your proceedings has been. We seem to be transported back to the passovers of Josiah or Hezekiah.

Mr. Allan left for Beyrout a fortnight ago, and will, I suppose, by this time be on the road to Damascus. The news which we have heard of Dr. Wilson do not lead us to expect him for some time to come in this city. If you write to him here, be so good as urge him to visit us in Jassy.

I had made preparations for returning to Jassy last Thursday, but was unable to proceed from sickness. Since then Mr. Schwartz has arrived from Pesth, and I will be able to leave the matters of the mission here with more comfort in his hands—hoping to be able to travel next Saturday. I have just received a letter from Mr. Philip, announcing the failure of his attempt to begin the schools. We must hope, through the blessing of God, that it may yet be made to prosper. There is a great deal of reading of the Word of God amongst the Jassy Jews, which makes me reluctant to look despairingly upon the station. I know not where you would find a better.

I have thought it better to delay my accounts with Mr. Bonar till my return to Jassy.—With many acknowledgments for all your attentions, I remain, &c.,

DANIEL EDWARD.

#### LETTER FROM MR. HERBERMAN PHILIP TO J. G. WOOD, ESQ.

Jassy, July 7, 1843.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have received your letter, dated 2d June, which you sent to me in the name of the Free Presbyterian Church's General Assembly. I hope you have received my last letter, from which you will see that I adhere to the principles of the above mentioned Church. Also my other worthy friends, with whom I have the pleasure of standing in correspondence, will have seen from my letters that I cleave to that Church of which Christ is the Head. And now, in answer to the above named Assembly's letter, I declare that I adhere to the principles of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, of which, I trust, Christ is the Head and only Ruler,—and trust to be able to say that I shall never leave it, whatever the consequences may be, or into whatever state the Church be brought. I sympathize with my friends and brethren in that Church, and trust that my prayers for the deliverance of Zion will meet with theirs at the throne of grace. I doubt not that these tribulations will be as the refiner's fire, and as fuller's soap; and that they are signs or forerunners of a glorious time for the Church, which seems to be near at hand.

HERBERMAN PHILIP.

#### FOREIGN MISSIONS.

##### COLLECTION ON SABBATH, THE 22ND OF OCTOBER.

By appointment of the General Assembly, the Collection in aid of the Foreign Missions of the Free Church of Scotland will be made in all the Congregations and Missionary Stations of the Free Church, on *Sabbath, the 22nd day of the present month*. Ministers and Preachers are requested to read the following Address from their pulpits, on Sabbath the 15th, and to recommend this important Scheme to the extended liberality of their people.

## ADDRESS BY THE COMMITTEE.

Having been appointed by the first General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland to superintend her operations on the field of Foreign Missions, we feel it to be at once our duty and our privilege to remind you that the annual collection for that object is to be made in all our congregations on Sabbath the 22d inst., and to submit a few considerations, suggested partly by the peculiar circumstances in which you are now placed, but still more by the general character and design of the Christian Church at all times and in all conditions, which may serve, under the Divine blessing, to call forth, on this interesting occasion, your liberal contributions and your fervent prayers, for the maintenance and extension of Christ's kingdom among the benighted nations of India.

It gives us heart-felt pleasure to announce *the cordial and unanimous adherence to the Free Church of all the Missionaries* who have had an opportunity of communicating their sentiments to the Committee in this country. We have received letters from Dr. Wilson, Mr. Nesbit, and Mr. J. Murray Mitchell, at Bombay; from Mr. J. Mitchell and Mr. James Aitken, at Poonah,—all equally decided and explicit in their adherence to the principles of this Church. The sentiments of the other Missionaries at Calcutta and Madras are known to us only through letters written to private friends in the prospect of the disruption; but as yet no official communication has reached us from these more distant stations, partly, perhaps, in consequence of the unexpected delay which has occurred in the transmission of the last overland mail. But without anticipating the tidings which may so soon be expected, or divulging the private information which has reached us, we may express our confident hope that the band of Christian missionaries in India will be united in this, as they have hitherto been in every thing bearing on the honour of Christ and the interests of His spiritual kingdom.

We advert to this interesting fact, not merely because it affords a valuable testimony to the cause in which the Church has been called to suffer for the name of Christ, but also because it addresses to us a call, to which few, we trust, will be insensible, for unwearied exertions and increased liberality in providing for the support of those institutions which these devoted men have been honoured to found in India. They left their native country, and went forth to a strange land, trusting in the promise and providence of Him who is "Head over all things to his Church;" but expecting, at the same time, that the love and zeal which his Spirit had kindled in the breasts of their brethren in Scotland, would furnish the means, of continuing and extending those disinterested labours by which they hope ultimately to gather in a precious harvest for the Lord: and when, in a time of severe trial, they cast in their lot with yours, and, for conscience' sake, prefer the Free Church of Scotland, impoverished as it has been, to the National Establishment, with all its temporal resources, can you withhold from them the tribute of your admiring gratitude, or fail to fulfil the expectations which your former love and zeal mainly inspired? It is true, that the missionaries, with that unwavering confidence and humble trust in God, which constitute the strength of the missionary cause, express their conviction that resources may be found in India itself, which will go far to support our institutions there; and we concur with them in thinking that much will probably be done, by generous officers and civilians, whose Christian zeal and devotedness will only lead them to feel a deeper interest in the cause when its former supports may seem to be weakened; for, thank God! there has been a revival of pure religion among not a few of the European residents, and we should have little fear of the result, were the care of our present institutions devolved on the Army alone;—but when we consider that these institutions

require to be indefinitely extended, if they are to exert any influence on the general mind of India, and that probably the buildings, which have hitherto afforded at once a suitable residence and a commodious scene of labour to our missionaries, may be alienated to other parties, we feel that redoubled energy is necessary at home, in addition to all the aid which can reasonably be expected from abroad, if we would maintain and carry on the great work which has been so auspiciously begun.

By the declared adherence of our beloved brethren in India, the Lord is putting this piece of service into our hands, and giving us the privilege and honour of being fellow-workers with them in extending the boundaries of His glorious kingdom. And this is a service which the Free Church of Scotland cannot decline. on the plea of her present privations and poverty, or on any other pretext, without virtually declaring her distrust in the promise and the providence of God, and depriving herself of her highest privilege as a Church of Christ. There may be a temptation, in existing circumstances, to contract her efforts, and many may feel as if it were unreasonable to urge the claims of Foreign Missions at a time when thousands are compelled to worship God in our own land, without the shelter even of the rudest building, under the canopy of heaven;—they may speak of the churches which must be built, of the ejected minister whose wants must be supplied, of the destitute congregations whose claims are alike urgent and undeniable,—and they may imagine, that for a time at least, Providence seems to have relieved them of the duty of contributing to the support of institutions with which they have no local connection, and little personal concern. But is it not the wish and the prayer of every true disciple in Scotland, that the Free Church should, from its very commencement, exhibit a complete model of a Christian Church in full and vigorous operation? and can it aspire to this character, if rejoicing in its own evangelical privileges, it forgets its great evangelistic function, as an institution divinely appointed “to make God’s name known upon the earth, and his saving health among all nations?” May we not say, in the language of Dr. Duff, uttered on a different occasion, but emphatically true of the present,—“Now, if ever, is the time to exhibit, not only the model of a Gospel Church, but a complete model in full operation.” “We at once count our hundreds of thousands of members united together as a Church, under one of the noblest, and purest, and most apostolical constitutions which the world has ever seen. We have the entire machinery ready made. We have only to arise, and, in the strength of our God, set all the parts of it in motion, and thus, at once and simultaneously, discharge all the functions, not merely of an evangelic, but of an evangelistic Church.

In another aspect, the circumstances of the present times should stimulate every believer to work while it is day. Whatever may be the ultimate issue of the events which have recently occurred, no intelligent Christian can contemplate the present condition of the Church in the United Kingdom, without acknowledging that her prospects are dark and threatening. It may be that the Lord is preparing us for some more glorious manifestation of gospel truth in our native land; it may also be, that, for grace despise, and privileges neglected or abused, He is preparing to remove our candlestick out of its place; but, in the midst of the uncertainty which hangs over the future, should not every Christian feel that it is his present duty to do whatever lies within the compass of his power to provide an asylum for a pure gospel and a Free Church in other lands, and especially in those to which Providence points as the most promising field of missionary labour, by affording unusual facilities of access and communication; and, in this view, should we not, with admiration and gratitude, acknowledge the Lord’s hand in placing the millions of India under the sway of this country, in opening up a door of entrance to every part of its extended territory, in throwing the shield of

British protection over our institutions there; and above all, in raising up and qualifying so many devoted missionaries for the work to which they are called? And have you not every encouragement to persevere in the glorious work? Have you not the command of Christ—a command which carries in it a tacit promise, that the gospel should be preached to all nations? have you not the prophetic assurance, that all the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of God and his Christ? And as often as you use the simple prayer which Christ taught to his disciples, do you not continually express your wish and hope, that His kingdom may come, and that His will may be done on earth even as it is done in heaven? And can you refuse to contribute to the accomplishment of Christ's promise, and your own prayers? It is true that the prophetic word will find its accomplishment in its own time, and God is not dependent on your exertions for the fulfilment of his will; but would you willingly forfeit the privilege of being fellow-workers with God, or incur the guilt of refusing your service to Him who, "though he was rich, yet for your sakes became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich?"

HENRY GREY, *Vice-Convener.*

#### ARRIVAL OF DR. WILSON.

---

We have the great satisfaction of announcing, that this devoted missionary of the Free Church of Scotland, arrived in London on Saturday, the 23d ultimo, in the enjoyment of restored health. He left Bombay, the sphere of his last fifteen years' labours, in January, and since then, as our readers know, has visited Egypt, the Holy Land, &c. He has possessed himself of much valuable and new information, and sketches of various interesting localities, which may yet be given to the public. The Doctor has brought with him, for the completion of his education for the ministry, one of the Parsi youths, whose name is well known to the readers of the *Missionary Record*, Danjibhoy Noorooji. He has also conducted from Pesth two Jewish converts, Messrs Edensheim and Tomorry, who will be under the care of Dr. Duncan and the Jews' Committee. On Sabbath evening, Dr. Wilson preached a deeply interesting discourse to the congregation of the Rev. P. Lorimer, Islington, successor to the Rev. John Macdonald, now of the mission, Calcutta; and on Monday he was to give an address in Regent Square Church. Dr. Wilson's appearance in the General Assembly to be holden in Glasgow on the 17th, will give an additional interest to that important meeting.

#### VI.—THE DUKE OF SUTHERLAND.

##### VI.

We have exhibited to our readers, in the *clearing* of Sutherland, a process of ruin so thoroughly disastrous, that it might be deemed scarce possible to render it more complete. And yet with all its apparent completeness, it admitted of a supplementary process. To employ one of the striking figures of Scripture, it was possible to grind into powder what had been previously broken into fragments,—to degrade the poor inhabitants to a still

lower level than that on which they had been so cruelly precipitated,—though persons of a not very original cast of mind might have found it difficult to say how: and the Duke of Sutherland has been ingenious enough to fall on exactly the one proper expedient for supplementing their ruin. All in mere circumstance and situation that could lower and deteriorate, had been present as ingredients in the first process; but there still remained for the people, however reduced to poverty, or broken in spirit, all in religion that consoles and ennobles. Sabbath days came round with their humanizing influences; and, under the teachings of the gospel, the poor and the oppressed looked longingly forward to a future scene of being, in which there is no poverty and no oppression. They still possessed, amid their misery, something positively good, of which it was possible to deprive them; and hence the ability derived to the present lord of Sutherland, of deepening and rendering more signal the ruin accomplished by his predecessor.

Napoleon, when on the eve of re-establishing Popery in France, showed his conviction of the importance of national religions, by remarking that, did there exist no ready-made religion to serve his turn, he would be under the necessity of making one on purpose. And his remark, though perhaps thrown into this form, merely to give it point and render it striking, has been instanced as a proof that he could not have considered the matter very profoundly. It has been said, and said truly, that religions of stamina enough to be even politically useful cannot be *made*,—that it is comparatively easy to gain great battles, and frame important laws; but that to create a religion is to create a belief; and that to create belief lay beyond the power of even a Napoleon. France, instead of crediting his manufactured religion, would have laughed at both him and it. The Duke of Sutherland has, however, taken upon himself a harder task than the one to which Napoleon could refer, probably in joke. His aim seems to be, not the comparatively simple one of making a new religion where no religion existed before, but of making men already firm in their religious convictions to believe that to be a religion which they believe to be no such thing. His undertaking involves a *discharging* as certainly as an *injecting* process,—the erasure of an existing belief, as certainly as the infusion of an antagonist belief that has no existence. We have shown how Evangelism took root and grew in Sutherland, as the only form of Christianity which its people could recognise,—how the antagonist principle of Moderatism they failed to recognise as Christianity at all,—and how, when the latter was obtruded into their pulpits, they withdrew from the churches in which their fathers had worshipped, for they could regard them as churches no longer, and held their prayer and fellowship meetings in their own homes, or travelled far to attend the ministrations of clergymen in whose mission they *could* believe. We have shown that this state of feeling and belief still pervades the county. It led to an actual disruption between its Evangelized people and its Moderate clergy, long ere the disruption of last May took place;—that important event has had but the effect of marshalling them into one compact body under a new name. They are adherents of the Free Church now, just because they have been adherents to its principles for the last two centuries. And to shake them loose from this adherence is the object of his Grace,—to reverse the belief of ages,—to render them indifferent to that which they feel and believe to be religion,—and to make them regard as religion that which they know to be none. His task is harder by a great deal than that to which Napoleon could advert; and how very coarse and repulsive his purposed means of accomplishing it!

These harmonise but too well with the mode in which the interior of Sutherland was cleared, and the improved cottages of its sea-coasts erected. The plan has its two items. No sites are to be granted in the district for Free churches, and no dwelling-houses for Free Church ministers. The

climate is severe,—the winters prolonged and stormy,—the roads which connect the chief seats of population with the neighbouring counties, dreary and long. May not minister and people be eventually worn out in this way? Such is the portion of the plan which his Grace and his Grace's creatures can afford to present to the light. But there are supplementary items of a somewhat darker kind. The poor cottars are, in the great majority of cases, tenants at will; and there has been much pains taken to inform them, that to the crime of entertaining and sheltering a Protestant minister, the penalty of ejection from their holdings must inevitably attach. The laws of Charles have again returned in this unhappy district, and free and tolerating Scotland has got, in the nineteenth century, as in the seventeenth, its intercommuned ministers. We shall not say that the intimation has emanated from the Duke. It is the misfortune of such men, that there creep around them creatures whose business it is to anticipate their wishes; but who, at times, doubtless, instead of anticipating, misinterpret them; and who even when not very much mistaken, impart to whatever they do the impress of their own low and menial natures, and thus exaggerate in the act, the intention of their masters. We do not say, therefore, that the intimation has emanated from the Duke; but this we say, that an exemplary Sutherlandshire minister of the Protestant Church, who resigned his worldly all for the sake of his principles, had lately to travel, that he might preach to his attached people, a long journey of forty-five miles outwards, and as much in return, and all this without taking shelter under the cover of a roof, or without partaking of any other refreshment than that furnished by the slender store of provisions which he had carried with him from his new home. Willingly would the poor Highlanders have received him at any risk; but knowing from experience what a Sutherlandshire removal means, he preferred enduring any amount of hardship, rather than that the hospitality of his people should be made the occasion of their ruin. We have already adverted to the case of a lady of Sutherland threatened with ejection from her home because she had extended the shelter of her roof to one of the Protestant clergy,—an aged and venerable man who had quitted the neighbouring manse, his home, for many years, because he could no longer enjoy it in consistency with his principles. And we have shown that that aged and venerable man was the lady's own father. What amount of oppression of a smaller and more petty character may not be expected in the circumstances, when cases such as these are found to stand but a very little over the ordinary level! The meannesses to which ducal hostility can stoop in this hapless district, impress with a feeling of surprise. In the parish of Dornoch, for instance, where his Grace is fortunately not the sole landowner, there has been a site procured on the most generous terms from Sir George Gun Munro of Pointzfield; and this gentleman,—believing himself possessed of a hereditary right to a quarry, which, though on the Duke's ground, had been long resorted to by the proprietors of the district generally,—instructed the builder to take from it the stones which he needed. Here, however, his Grace interfered. Never had the quarry been prohibited before; but, on this occasion, a stringent interdict arrested its use. If his Grace could not prevent a hated Free Church from arising in the district, he could at least add a little additional to the expense of its erection. We have even heard that the portion of the building previously erected had to be pulled down, and the stones returned.

How are we to account for a hostility so determined, and that can stoop so low? In two different ways, we are of opinion, and in both have the people of Scotland a direct interest. Did his Grace entertain a very intense regard for Established Presbytery, it is probable that he himself would be a Presbyterian of the Establishment. But such is not the case. The Church



into which he would so fain force the people has been long since deserted by himself. The secret of the course which he pursues can have no connection therefore with religious motive or belief. It can be no proselytising spirit that misleads his Grace. Let us remark, in the first place, rather, however, in the way of embodying a fact than imputing a motive, that with his present views, and in his present circumstances, it may not seem particularly his Grace's interest to make the country of Sutherland a happy or desirable home to the people of Sutherland. It may not seem his Grace's interest that the population of the district should increase. The *clearing* of the seacoast may seem as little prejudicial to his Grace's welfare now, as the *clearing* of the interior seemed adverse to the interests of his predecessor thirty years ago; nay, it is quite possible that his Grace may be led to regard the *clearing* of the coast as the better and more important *clearing* of the two. Let it not be forgotten that a poor-law hangs over Scotland;—that the shores of Sutherland are covered with what seems one vast straggling village, inhabited by an impoverished and ruined people;—and that the coming assessment may yet fall so weighty, that the extra profits derived to his Grace from his large sheep-farms, may go but a small way in supporting his extra paupers. It is not in the least improbable, that he may live to find the revolution effected by his predecessor taking to itself the form, not of a crime,—for that would be nothing,—but of a disastrous and very terrible blunder.

There is another remark which may prove not unworthy the consideration of the reader. Ever since the completion of the fatal experiment which ruined Sutherland, the noble family through which it was originated and carried on have betrayed the utmost jealousy of having its real results made public. Volumes of special pleading have been written on the subject,—pamphlets have been published;—laboured articles have been inserted in widely-spread reviews,—statistical accounts have been watched over with the most careful surveillance;—if the misrepresentations of the press could have altered the matter of fact, famine would not have been gnawing the vitals of Sutherland in every year just a little less abundant than its fellows, nor would the dejected and oppressed people be feeding their discontent amid present misery with the recollections of a happier past. If a singularly well-conditioned and wholesome district of country has been converted into one wide ulcer of wretchedness and woe, it must be confessed that the sore has been carefully bandaged up from the public eye, and that if there has been little done for its cure, there has at least been much done for its concealment. Now, be it remembered, that the Free Church threatens to insert a *tent* into this wound, and so keep it open. It has been said that the Gaelic language removes a district more effectually from the influence of English opinion than an ocean of three thousand miles, and that the British public know better what is doing in New York than what is doing in Lewis or Skye. And hence one cause, at least, of the thick obscurity that has so long enveloped the miseries which the poor Highlander has had to endure, and the oppressions to which he has been subjected. The Free Church threatens to *translate* his wrongs into English, and to give them currency in the general mart of opinion. She might possibly enough be no silent spectator of confagurations such as those which characterised the first general improvement of Sutherland,—nor yet of such Egyptian schemes of house-building as that which formed part of the improvements of a latter plan. She might be somewhat apt to betray the real state of the district, and thus render laborious misrepresentation of little avail. She might effect a diversion in the cause of the people, and shake the foundations of the hitherto despotic power which has so long weighed them down. She might do for Sutherland what Cobbett promised to do for it, but what Cobbett had not character enough to

accomplish, and what he did not live even to attempt. A combination of circumstances have conspired to vest in a Scottish proprietor, in this northern district, a more despotic power than even the most absolute monarchs of the Continent possess; and it is perhaps, no great wonder that that proprietor should be jealous of the introduction of an element which threatens, it may seem, materially to lessen it. He struggles hard to exclude the Free Church, therefore; and, though no member of the Establishment himself, declaims warmly in its behalf. Certain it is, that from the Establishment, as now constituted, he can have nothing to fear, and the people nothing to hope.

After what manner may his Grace the Duke of Sutherland be most effectually met in this matter, so that the cause of toleration and freedom of conscience may be maintained in the extensive district which God, in his providence, has consigned to his stewardship? We shall take an early opportunity of giving the question an answer as we best can. Meanwhile we trust the people of Sutherland will continue, as hitherto, to stand firm. The strong repugnance which they feel against being driven into churches which all their better ministers have left, is not ill founded. No Church of God ever employs such means of conversion as those employed by his Grace: they are means which have been often resorted to for the purpose of making man worse,—never yet for the purpose of making them better. We know that with their long formed church-going habits, the people must feel their now silent Sabbaths pass heavily; but they would perhaps do well to remember, amid the tedium and the gloom, that there were good men who not only anticipated such a time of trial for this country, but who also made provision for it. Thomas Scott, when engaged in writing his Commentary, used to solace himself with the belief that it might be of use at a period when the public worship of God would be no longer tolerated in the land. To the great bulk of the people of Sutherland that time seems to have already come. They know, however, the value of the old Divines, and have not a few of their more practical treatises translated into their own expressive tongue,—*Alleine's Alarm*,—*Boston's Fourfold State*,—*Doddridge's Rise and Progress*,—*Baxter's Call*,—*Guthrie's Saving Interest*. Let these, and such as these, be their preachers, when they can procure no other. The more they learn to relish them, the less will they relish the bald and miserable services of the Residuary Church. Let them hold their fellowship and prayer meetings,—let them keep up the worship of God in their families: the cause of religious freedom in the district is involved in the stand which they make. Above all, let them possess their souls in patience. We are not unacquainted with the Celtic character, as developed in the Highlands of Scotland. Highlanders, up to a certain point, are the most docile, patient, enduring of men; but that point once passed, endurance ceases, and the all too gentle lamb starts up an angry lion. The spirit is stirred up to madness at the sight of the naked weapon, and that, in its headlong rush upon the enemy, discipline can neither check nor control. Let our oppressed Highlanders of Sutherland beware. They have suffered much; but, so far as man is the agent, their battles can be fought on only the arena of public opinion, and on that ground which the political field may be soon found to furnish. Any explosion of violence on their part would be ruin to both the Church and themselves.

---

## VII.

How is the battle of religious toleration to be best fought in behalf of the oppressed people of Sutherland? We shall attempt throwing out a few simple suggestions on the subject, which, if in the right tract, the reader may find it easy to follow up and mature.

First, then, let us remember, that in this country, in which opinion is all-potent, and which, for at least a century and a half, has been the envy of Continental States, for the degree of religious freedom which it enjoys, the policy of the Duke of Sutherland cannot be known without being condemned. The current which he opposes has been scooping out its channel for ages. Every great mind produced by Britain, from the times of Milton and of Locke down to the times of Mackintosh and of Chalmers, has been giving it impetus in but one direction; and it is scarce likely that it will reverse its course now, at the bidding of a few intolerant and narrow-minded aristocrats. British opinion has but to be fairly appealed to, in order to declare strongly in favour of the oppressed Highlanders of Sutherland. What we would first remark, then, is, that the policy of his Grace the Duke cannot be too widely exposed. The press and the platform must be employed,—the frank and generous English must be told, that that law of religious toleration which did so much at a comparatively early period to elevate the character of their country in the eye of the world, and which, in these latter times, men have been accustomed to regard as somewhat less, after all, than an adequate embodiment of the rights of conscience, has been virtually repealed in a populous and very extensive district of the British empire, through a capricious exercise of power on the part of a single man. Why, it has been asked, in a matter which lies between God and the conscience, and between God and the conscience only, should a third party be permitted to interfere so far as even to say, “I tolerate you? I tolerate your Independency,—your Episcopacy,—your Presbyterianism;—you are a Baptist, but I tolerate you.” There is an insult implied, it has been said, in the way in which the liberty purports to be granted. It bestows as a boon what already exists as a right. We want no despot to tell us that he gives us leave to breathe the free air of heaven, or that he permits us to worship God agreeably to the dictates of our conscience. Such are the views with which a majority of the British people regard, in these latter times, the right to tolerate; and regarding a *right* not to tolerate, they must be more decided still. The Free Church, then, must lay her complaint before them. She must tell them that such is the oppression to which her people are subjected, that she would be but too happy to see even the ‘beggarly elements of the question recognised in their behalf—that she would be but too happy to hear the despot of a province pronounce the deprecated “I tolerate you,” seeing that his virtual enunciation at present is, “I do *not* tolerate you,” and seeing that he is powerful enough, through a misapplication of his rights and influence, as the most extensive of British proprietors, to give terrible effect to the unjust and illiberal determination. The free Church, on this question, must raise her appeal every where to public opinion, and we entertain no doubt whatever that she will every where find it her friend.

But how is its power to be directed?—How bring it to bear upon the Duke of Sutherland? It is an all-potent lever, but it must be furnished with a fulcrum on which to rest, and a direction in which to bear. Let us remark, first, that no signal privilege or right was ever yet achieved for Britain, that was not preceded by some signal wrong. From the times of Magna Charta down to the times of the Revolution, we find every triumph of liberty heralded in by some gross outrage upon it. The history of the British Constitution is a history of great natural rights established piecemeal under the immediate promptings of an indignation elicited by unbearable wrongs. It was not until the barrier that protected the privileges of the citizen from the will of the despot, was way at some weak point, that the parties exposed to the inundation were roused up to

re-erect it on a better principle and a surer foundation. Now, the Duke of Sutherland (with some of his brother proprietors) has just succeeded in showing us a signal flaw in our scheme of religious toleration; and this at an exceedingly critical time. He has been perpetrating a great and palpable wrong, which, if rightly represented, must have the effect of leading men, in exactly the old mode, to arouse themselves in behalf of the corresponding right. If a single proprietor can virtually do what the Sovereign of Great Britain would forfeit the Crown for barely attempting to do,—if a single nobleman can do what the House of Lords, in its aggregate capacity, would peril its very existence for but proposing to do,—then does there exist in the British Constitution a palpable flaw, which cannot be too soon remedied. There must be a weak place in the barrier, if the waters be rushing out; and it cannot be too soon rebuilt on a surer plan. Here, then, evidently, is the point on which the generated opinion ought to be brought to bear. It has as its proper arena the political field. It is a defect in the British Constitution, strongly exemplified by the case of Sutherland, that the rights of property may be so stretched as to overbear the rights of conscience,—that though toleration be the law of the country generally, it may be so set aside by the country's proprietary, as not to be the law in any particular part of it; and to reverse this state of things,—to make provision in the Constitution, that the rights of the proprietor be not so overstretched, and that a virtual repeal of the toleration laws in any part of the country be not possible,—are palpably the objects to which the public mind should be directed.

We have said, that the Duke of Sutherland has succeeded in showing us this flaw in the Constitution at a peculiarly critical time. A gentleman resident in England, for whose judgment we entertain the highest respect, told us only a few days since, that the rising all-absorbing party of that kingdom, so far at least as the Established Church and the aristocracy are concerned, still continues to be the Puseyite party. If Puseyism does not bid fair to possess a majority of the people of the country, it bids fair at least to possess a majority of its acres. And we need scarce remind the reader how peculiarly this may be the case with Scotland, whose acres, in such large proportions, are under the control of an incipient Puseyism already. In both countries, therefore, is it of peculiar importance, in a time like the present, that the law of toleration should be placed beyond the control of a hostile or illiberal proprietary,—so placed beyond their control, that they may be as unable virtually to suspend its operation in any part of the country, as they already are to suspend its operation in the whole of the country. We are recommending, be it remembered, no wild scheme of Chartist aggression on the rights of property,—we would but injure our cause by doing so; our strength in this question must altogether depend on the soundness of the appeal which we can carry to the natural justice of the community. We merely recommend that to be done in behalf of the already recognised law of toleration, which Parliament has no hesitation in doing in behalf of some railway or canal, or water or dock company, when, for what is deemed a public good, it sets aside the absolute control of the proprietor over at least a portion of his property, and consigns it at a fair price to the corporation engaged in the undertaking. The principle of the scheme is already recognised by the Constitution, and its legislative embodiment would be at once easy and safe. Property would be rendered not less, but more secure, if, in every instance in which a regularly organized congregation of any denomination of Christians to which the law of toleration itself extended, made application for ground on which to erect a place of worship, the application would be backed and made effectual, in virtue of an enacted law, by the authority of the Consti-

tution. There is no Scotch or English Dissenter,—no true friend of religious liberty, in Britain or Ireland,—who would not make common cause with the Free Church in urging a measure of this character on Parliament, when fairly convinced by cases such as that of Sutherland, how imperatively such a measure is required!

Unavoidably, however, from the nature of things, the relief which ultimately may be thus secured, cannot be other than distant relief. Much information must first be spread, and the press and the platform extensively employed. Can there be nothing done for Sutherland through an already existing political agency? We are of opinion there can. Sutherland itself is even more thoroughly a *close county* now, than it was ere the Reform Bill had swamped the paper votes, and swept away the *close burghs*. His grace the Duke has but to nominate his member, and his member is straightway returned. But all the political power which, directly or indirectly, his Grace possesses, is not equally secure. Sutherland is a *close county*; but the Northern Burghs are not rotten burghs; on the contrary, they possess an independent and intelligent constituency; and in scarce any part of Scotland is the Free Church equally strong. And his Grace derives no inconsiderable portion of his political influence from them. The Member for Sutherland is virtually his Grace's nominee, but the Member for the Northern Burghs is not his Grace's nominee at all;—and yet certain it is, that the gentleman by whom these burghs are at present represented in Parliament is his Grace's agent and adviser in all that pertains to the management of Sutherland, and has been so for many years. His Grace's Member for Sutherland sits in Parliament, in virtue of being his Grace's nominee; but the sort of Prime Minister through which his Grace governs his princely domains, sits in Parliament, not in virtue of being his Grace's nominee, but in virtue of his being himself a man of liberal opinions, and an enemy to all intolerance. He represents them in the Whig interest, and in his character as a Whig. His Grace would very soon have one member less in Parliament, did that member make common cause with his Grace in suppressing the Free Church in Sutherland. Now, the bruit shrewdly goeth, that that member does make common cause with his Grace. The bruit shrewdly goeth, that in this, as in most other matters, his Grace acts upon that member's advice. True, the report may be altogether idle,—it may be utterly without foundation; instead of being true, it may be exactly the reverse of being true; but most unquestionable it is, that, whether true or otherwise, that member's constituency have a very direct interest in it. He represents them miserably ill, and must be a very different sort of Whig from them, if he hold that proprietors do right in virtually setting aside the Toleration Act. The report does one of two things,—it either does him great injustice, or it shows that he has sat too long in Parliament for the Northern Burghs. It is in the power, then, of the highly respectable and intelligent Whig constituency of this district to make such a diversion in favour of the oppressed people of Sutherland, as would scarce fail to tell upon the country, and this in thorough consistency with the best and highest principles of their party. Let them put themselves in instant communication with their member, and stating the character of the report to his prejudice which so generally exists, request a categorical answer regarding it;—let them request an avowal of his opinion of the Duke's policy, equally articulate with that opinion which the Honourable Mr. Fox Maule submitted to the public in our last number;—and then, as the ascertained circumstances of the case may direct, let them act, and that publicly, in strict accordance with their principles. Of one thing they may be assured,—the example will tell.

In order to raise the necessary amount of opinion for carrying the ulterior object,—the enactment of a law,—there are various most justifiable means to which the friends of toleration in the country should find it not difficult to resort. Petitions addressed to the Lower House in its legislative capacity, and to the members of the Upper House as a body of men who have, perhaps, of all others, the most direct stake in the matter, ~~we~~ we need scarce say how,—ought, of course, to take a very obvious place on the list. Much too might be done by deputations from the General Assembly of the Free Church instructed from time to time to ascertain, and then publicly to report on, the state of Sutherland. Each meeting of Assembly might be addressed on the subject by some of its ablest men, in which case their statements and speeches would go forth, through the medium of the press, to the country at large. The co-operation and assistance of all bodies of Evangelical Dissenters, both at home and abroad, should be sedulously sought after, and correct information on the subject circulated among them extensively. There has been much sympathy elicited for the Church, during her long struggle, among good men everywhere. Her cause has been tried, and judgment given in her favour, in France, Holland, and America, and in not a few of the colonies. In the case of Sismondi, "*On the Clearing of Sutherland*," we see the opinion of a Continental philosopher re-echoed back upon our own country, not without its marked effect; and it might be well to try whether the effect of foreign opinion might not be at least equally influential "*On the Suppression of the Toleration Laws in Sutherland*." There is one great country with which we hold our literature in common, and which we can address, and by which we can be in turn addressed, in our native tongue. Unluckily, what ought to have existed as a bond of union has been made to subserve hitherto a very different purpose; and we cannot conceal from ourselves the melancholy fact, that our own country has been mainly to blame. The manners, habits, and tastes of the Americans have been exhibited by not a few of our popular writers, in the broadest style of caricature; they have been described as a nation of unprincipled speculators, devoid not only of right feeling, but even of common honesty, and remarkable for nothing but their scoundreling and conceit. Even were such descriptions just, most assuredly would they be unwise. It is the American people rather than the American Government, who make peace and war; and the first American war with England will be one of the most formidable in which this country has yet been engaged. The bowie-knife is no trifling weapon; and the English writer laughs at a very considerable expense, if his satires have the effect of whetting it. At present, however, the war between the two countries is but a war of libel and pasquinade, and the advantage hitherto has been on the side of the aggressor. America has not been happy in her retaliation. We would fain direct her to aim, where her darts, instead of provoking national hostility, or exciting a bitter spirit among the entire people of a country, would but subserve the general cause of liberty and human improvement. It is but idle to satirize our manners and customs: we think them good. There is nothing to be gained by casting ridicule on our peculiar modes of thought: they are the modes to which we have been accustomed, and we prefer them to any others. But there are matters of a different kind, regarding which the country bears a conscience, and is not quite at its ease; and there we are vulnerable. We speak often, we would fain say, of slavery in your country, literati of America, and justly deem it a great evil. It might do us good were you to remind us, in turn, that there are extensive districts in our own, in which virtually there exists no toleration law for the religion

of the people, though that religion be Protestantism in its purest form. Cast your eyes upon Sutherland.

We shall take frequent occasions of returning to this subject, and shall meanwhile try whether we cannot condense into the form of a cheap pamphlet, the series of articles on it which have already appeared in our columns.

## VII.—THE NINETY-THIRD HIGHLANDERS.

*(From the Witness.)*

We perhaps owe an apology to the writer of the following letter, for making bold to insert it in our columns, but are quite sure we shall be found to owe no apology for its insertion, to the reader. It bears date only a few days posterior to the appearance of our article on the 93d or *Sutherland, Highlanders*, and comes from a non-commissioned officer of that regiment, now stationed in Canada, in his own name, and that of his comrades. We little thought, when engaged in describing in behalf of the Free Church in Sutherland, the character which this admirable regiment bore some five and twenty or thirty years ago, that we had still our warm friends in its ranks,—or that, when we were thinking of it with high respect and admiration, these were thinking of the Free Church with feelings of thorough sympathy and regard. We accept with gratitude their free-will offering in behalf of the cause,—valuing it all the more highly from the just appreciation of our principles in which it has originated. To the Christian soldier who pens this letter, it *“is a source of consolation and thankfulness to God, to find that the mighty chain of faith and obedience, which unites the Church to her Almighty Head, were traceable through her whole conduct, during the trying events which led to the present state of things”* No vulgar man could have arrived at such a conclusion, or have embodied it in such language. There is another point of view in which we are also interested in this communication. In our series of articles on Sutherland, there is much that can scarce fail being challenged; many of the statements which they contain must be found unpalatable, and it is the interest of influential individuals that they should be deemed other than true. Of this, however, are we assured: so firmly are they based in reality, that future discoveries will tell, not to their discredit, but to their advantage. We shall have the slowly yielded but important testimony of time upon our side; and in the subjoined letter from the 93rd, so true to our character of that admirable regiment, we are furnished with an interesting earnest of the fact.

---

### TO THE PROPRIETORS OF THE WITNESS.

*Kingston, Canada, August 25, 1843.*

SIRS,—In transmitting to you the enclosed Exchange for £17. 8s. I feel great pleasure in humbly requesting that, after deducting the price for twelve months of your excellent paper, you will be pleased to transfer the balance to the funds of the “Free Church,” to be appropriated by the Committee in any way which their wisdom may direct.

The above amount (including 12s. from a kind citizen and a son of Scotia) however small a *mite*, is the free-will offering of a few friends in the 93d Highlanders, of whom, I trust, it may be said with a measure of propriety, that they have not been influenced in the matter by any *gust* of party spirit, but led, through a calm and impartial investigation, thus to testify their sincere and conscientious approval.

When I say investigation, I mean that, at least the few friends referred to, however distant from their native country, have been enabled to keep the eyes of their minds firmly fixed upon the Church, during the whole of the struggle. Yes, Sirs, and their bodily eyes were often upon the pages of the faithful *Witness*, which has given, and continues to give, a true and connected detail of all her proceedings.

It is remarkable, that at a certain stage of our Zion's contest for her vital principles, the worthy Dr. Chalmers himself had to confess, "that opposition and misconstruction had then so enveloped the vital question, as to mis-tify the minds of many."

However, to any unprejudiced mind, that can take an impartial and retrospective view of the *facts* of the case, it must now appear obvious that the Church contended throughout, not for a *shadow*, but for substance.

To every *true friend* of our Church, and of the gospel, it must be a source of consolation and thankfulness to God, to find that the mighty chain of the faith and obedience which unites her to her Almighty Head were traceable through her whole conduct during the trying events which led to the present state of things.

The weapons which she has made use of hitherto are spiritual, and it is to be hoped that no succeeding *event*, however trying, can by any means induce her to act a contrary part.

Let us all, then, in view of the whole as from the hand of the Lord, in our prayers for our Sovereign, our Church, and nation, adopt the beautiful language of the twentieth Psalm.

I remain, Sirs, &c.

## VIII.—A COINCIDENCE—OR, THE EDINBURGH FESTIVAL.

COINCIDENCES are not to be despised.—Where they do not instruct, they may at least arrest : and even where they may prove nothing, they may suggest much. We have now before us a remarkable instance of one sort of coincidence—a coincidence of time and place between the banishment of Christ's church, and the triumph of the world's sin. In the year 1843, in which the spiritual ministry of Jesus Christ is driven from the pulpits of Edinburgh, in that very year and in the sixth month after that deed was done, is the very theme of REDEMPTION BY JESUS CHRIST, in the form of a musical oratorio, set up as a subject of public entertainment, in that Christian metropolis ! Many years have elapsed since the last such performance in that city—a performance which was even then, when the subject was first introduced to notice, condemned by many godly men—and by one of the most venerated of those who are now Free Church Secessionists, who publicly declared that the judgments of God might be expected to visit the scenes of so awful profanity ; and judgment did follow in a remarkable form. The most fearful fire that ever visited Edinburgh, followed in a short time after—consuming houses, churches, courts, mercantile treasures and human lives before it. If profanity be a sin, and fire be a judgment, then here was at least a coincidence



of sin and judgment ;—whether this was the particular judgment of that particular sin, we do not profess to determine for others, whatever we may think for ourselves. We also know that many were then struck with the coincidence, and some were frightened :—but from whatever cause there has been no such great public profanation of Messiah's name (that we have heard of) from that time until now in Edinburgh.

In the *Edinburgh Evening Post* of September 30th, we find an advertisement to the following effect (abridged) :—

*“Edinburgh Musical Festival—October 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 1843. Under the Special Patronage of Her most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, &c.*

*Principal vocal Performers—Miss Birch, Mrs. Bushe, Miss Marshall, Mrs. Alfred Shaw : Messrs. Bennet, Manners, Hawkins, Stretton, Phillips.*

*Instrumental Performers—Loder, Dewar, Blagrove, Hargill, Guantlett—Baker, Dun, Leordley, Dragonetti, Platt, Harper.*

*Chorus—One hundred and twenty—Conductor Sir Henry Bishop—Tickets three guineas and a half—for the FESTIVAL—BALL-TICKETS will be issued at the same time.*

*Performances—Monday evening, “God save the Queen”—Madrigal.—“Flora gave me Fairest flowers,”—Aria “O Cara imagine !”—Glee and Chorus,—&c. “Andiamo, Andiam”—“Sento, O Dio.”—“Haste thee, Nymph”—Finale, overture to Oberon.*

*Tuesday Morning—Sacred Oratorio. “THE MESSIAH” “Comfort ye, Comfort ye my People, saith the Lord !” “Every valley shall be exalted”—“And the Glory of the Lord”—“Thus saith the Lord of Hosts”—“But who may abide the day of His coming !”—“Behold a virgin shall conceive”—“For unto us a child is born”—Behold the Lamb of God !”—“He was despised and rejected of men”—&c. &c. —“I know that my Redeemer liveth”—“For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall be made alive”—“The Trumpet shall sound”—O death where is thy sting !” &c. &c.*

*Wednesday—Jupiter, or grand sinfonia in C—“Ah perfido ed, per pietà”—“Sposa Euridice”—Ah ! mio Arturo !”—&c. &c.—“Eury-anthe”—Ombra adorata”—In Griselda—Overture to Fidelio.*

*Thursday Morning—THE CREATION ! “In the beginning God created”—“And the Spirit of God”—“God made the firmament”—&c. &c.—“Glory to God”—To Heaven's Almighty King—“Holy ! Holy ! Holy, Lord God Almighty !” But, bright Cecilia—“The dead shall live”—Lord to Thee each night and day.*

*Same day, Oratorio of THE LAST JUDGMENT. Jehovah now cometh in Judgment—It is ended—Blessed are the departed—&c. &c.—O Lord have mercy—The Lord shall reign—“Sing ye to the Lord !”*

*On the evening of the same day, A GRAND BALL AND SUPPER !*

*On Friday, a concert of common or profane, Music again—on Saturday, the Finale of Sacred or Oratorio Music as before, concluding with “Is this the region ?” from the Oratorio of “THE*

FALLEN ANGEL—and “veni, Spiritus Sancte!” Come, O Holy Spirit!—“O Lord, grant the Queen a long life!

Such is a specimen of the world’s treatment of divine things—mixing up the expression of the Redeemer’s agonies with amatory songs, and the Terrors of their own Judgment to come, with the Merry Ball and the Festive Supper! \* Alas, what is Scotland’s religion, what is Edinburgh’s evangelism come to, when such shameful profanities can, on such a scale, be perpetrated there! Calcutta was threatened with the same Exhibitions for a time—for the present it is freed from them—may it remain for ever so! Meanwhile the coincidence of scenes at home is not to be overlooked. If some cannot see it, others will, and others do: These two things at least are certain—the spirit of the world which supports the Oratorio, is the same spirit which has broken up this Protestant Church of Christ:—The Aristocracy, both landed and moneyed, of Scotland, which patronizes the Oratorio, is the same Aristocracy which has rejected and persecuted this Secession of Christ’s holy ministers and people:—these two have come to their height in one year, and in one place—be the cause what it may, or the conjecture what you will, there is at least a *peculiar coincidence*—we say no more than that—but we are at liberty to think much more than we say—and others are at liberty to think less than we write, if so they please.

---

\* That we are not singular in such opinion concerning Oratorios as performed for amusement, the following document will attest.

*Protest published and circulated against the Oratorio performed in Calcutta, in December 1839.*

*Calcutta, December 13, 1839.*

An intimation has appeared in the public prints, that it is intended to perform in the Town Hall of this city, on the 23rd instant, a “Selection from the Oratorio of the Messiah;” a piece which, as is well known, is designed by words and music to represent the grand work of human Redemption by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and which consists of some of the most solemn and affecting passages on this awful subject, that are to be found in the Holy Scripture.

As the performance of this Oratorio is not for a devotional end, but for the purpose of yielding entertainment, and thus securing gain; and as it therefore necessarily involves in it the profaning of God’s most sacred name, the desecrating of His holy word, and the degradation of the Divine theme of Redemption, we, the undersigned, deem it our bounden duty to publish our solemn and united protest against it; and earnestly and affectionately to entreat our fellow-Christians of every denomination in this place, to abstain from giving it their countenance and support.

In taking this step we are actuated solely by the deep conviction, that such a performance is offensive to Almighty God; and we are the rather impelled to make public this conviction, because we have reason to think that some may be led to attend it under the impression that it partakes of the nature of a religious service.

(Signed) James Charles, D. D., Senior Minister of St. Andrew’s Church, R. B. Boswell, B. A., Minister of St. James’s Church; W. H. Meiklejohn, Junior Minister of St. Andrew’s Church; R. B. Boyes, B. A., Junior Chaplain; Old Church; A. Garstin, Minister of St. Thomas’s (Free School) Church; T. Sandys, Church Missionary; J. W. Alexander, B. Molloy, G. Alexander, C. W. Smith, A. Beattie, J. Hawkins, G. J. Morris, J. Lewis, C. Tucker, F. Millett.

## IX.—AN ECCLESIASTICAL INCIDENT.

*The Transition of an Episcopalian Minister to the Free Presbyterian Church.*

We give the following document, as we find it—without note or comment. The fact recorded is sure ; the reasons assigned are open to judgment ;—we simply repeat the intelligence elsewhere given, as a matter of information.

## PRESBYTERY OF TORONTO.

From a report of the recent proceedings of this Presbytery, we extract the following letter of application from a Minister of the Church of England, for being received as a Minister of the Presbyterian Church.

## EXTRACT LETTER—REV. MR. COLEMAN TO REV. MR. BELL.

*Port Sarnia, August 1, 1843.*

MY DEAR SIR,—It is my wish to be received under the care of your presbytery, as student for the ministry, for these reasons,—that I consider your form of Church government and your ordination to be strictly scriptural, and in accordance with the statements of the earliest Church history—that your Confession of Faith is founded upon the truth of Scripture, and can be proved from it—that you admit to the ordinance of baptism such objects, only as are fit for it, viz., adults with saving belief, who have not been baptized in infancy, and the children of true believers—that you acknowledge Christ to be the only Head of the Church, and that ministers of the Church, in their ecclesiastical capacity, are not under the control of the civil jurisdiction, but amenable to the laws only as subjects of the realm in common with their fellow-citizens—that your manner of conducting public worship is highly edifying, is rational, scriptural, and to the honour of God, and, that you admit Scripture to be the only rule of faith, excluding the authority of the Fathers.

“My reasons for withdrawing from the ministry of the Church of England were, that Diocesan Episcopacy, or Prelacy, is unscriptural, evil in its tendency, and the original cause of the Papacy—that the Queen is not the head of the Church, that dignity belonging to Christ alone—that the admission of the children of nominal Christians to baptism, is unscriptural and evil—that the doctrine of the spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism, as set forth in the public Liturgy of the Church, is a figment of Popery, and a dangerous error—that the use of sponsors in baptism is very wrong, as leading individuals to the making of vows to God, they neither intend to fulfil, nor can fulfil ; as causing them falsely to assert to God that they are doing for another, what they are not doing, what they never mean to do,

---

W. N. Garrett, A. Grant, and J. M. Vos ; W. Yates, Missionary Minister ; T. Boaz, Pastor of Union Chapel ; J. Macdonald, D. Ewart, T. Smith, G. Gogerly, W. Morton, A. F. Lacroix, J. D. Ellis, J. Wenger, and W. H. Pearce, Missionary Ministers ; E. Tucker, B. A., Pastor of Circular Road Chapel ; J. Thomas, and F. Wybrow, Missionary Ministers.

and what they have never been able to do even for themselves ; and as being authorised by no text of God's word—that the indiscriminate use of burial service, as universally practised, is blasphemous—that the form of thanksgiving for the regeneration of the infant by the Holy Ghost in the baptismal service, causes the minister to utter a falsehood in the face of God—that that part of the 21st article, which asserts that General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes, is erroneous—and that the constant repetition of the same prayers day after day, is deadening to devotion. There are a few other reasons I could give, but these will be sufficient. I need not say that when I entered the ministry of the Church of England, it was fully under the impression that I was called thereto by the Holy Ghost, under a desire of advancing the glory of God, and being instrumental to the salvation of mankind. \* \* \* I am, &c.

### X.—A SHORT BUT HONOURED TESTIMONY.

We hoped to find space for several letters from the representatives of other Churches, expressive of deep interest in our Zion's prosperity. We can only find space for the following from Dr. Malan of Geneva, giving substantial proof of the estimation in which he and his flock held the testimony which, as a Church, we have been enabled to give forth.

#### LETTER FROM THE REV. DR. MALAN TO THE REV. DR. CANDLISH.

*Geneva, September 11, 1843.*

VERY DEAR AND MUCH HONOURED BROTHER,—I trust you have received the letter which I addressed, the 1st of June, to the *Free Church*. In it was the feeble, but cordial, expression of my feelings ; and to-day, after having received from my poor flock a small token of honour and Christian sympathy for the Free Church, I send to her, through your worthy hands, the sum of £10, which is, indeed, as nothing, in comparison of your wants, but which is the true manifestation of a love which would give treasures, had it them. Let, therefore, as it is written, "the willing mind be accepted," and our blessed Lord be honoured in His saints. His servants will find opposition from the world, but a true comfort will they receive from the Spirit of grace, and their mutual love and prayers will avail before God, and procure many secret and lasting consolations.

I am fully persuaded that our glorious King is with the *Free Church*, and that He is "the hearer of prayer" from His people. To Him, indeed, we wish to ascribe glory in that mighty performance of secession from an encroaching power. It will be seen in *His* own time, what connection has such a testimony with the coming of His everlasting kingdom and the destruction of "the Man of Sin." Let only any sincere disciple of His truth act simply, faithfully, and to-day ; for to-morrow is the Lord's and yesterday is gone.

Excuse my writing so little. My health is an obstacle to my correspondence, and I feel myself obliged to be rather too concise. But in the Spirit of faith and love, who is abiding in us, supply my feebleness, and secure in your heart the fraternity of mine.

My small congregation is uniting humble, but zeal and fervent supplications to God, for your steadfastness and celestial joy in hardships and mani-

fold difficulties. Oh ! let our souls be one, indeed, in the Son of God. To Him is the kingdom and power ; from Him is light, life, and victory over the world. Unto Him, as to the Father, through the Spirit, be adoration and thanksgivings !—Your most affectionate brother in Jesus, &.

## XI.—EDITORIAL NOTE.

It is intended that the **FIRST VOLUME** of the "*Free Churchman*" shall close with our next number, the last of this present year. The eight numbers which shall then have been issued, will form a neat and convenient volume, consisting of about 480 pages : and it seems therefore desirable, if the Lord prosper us as hitherto, to begin the new-year with a new volume—to be completed in twelve numbers, at the end of the next half-year.

Our Readers have perceived (although not to their *cost*,) that of late we have doubled the quantity of matter which we originally proposed to furnish (32 p. p.) as will be seen by reference to the first number—this was done chiefly in order to enrich our Readers by a perusal of Dr. Duff's able Lectures : for such large additions we have no provision made save that of editorial responsibility or individual risk ;—so that our readers cannot expect a continuance of such indulgence. Should, however, any of our wealthier subscribers encourage us by any additional grant, specially destined for this purpose, we shall very gladly persevere, as far as we can, in our additional size, and crowded letter-press ; doing thus what we are able for the promotion of our great cause, Church-Freedom, through our present channel. Our Subscription-list is quite sufficient to encourage us to persevere in our course of publication, on our first plan of supply :—we have had many testimonies of kind feeling from our readers, and have had at least some proofs of usefulness too : and whilst we mean to persevere steadily in our work, we give thanks, and commit our way, to that LORD to whose service the "*Free Churchman*" has been devoted. "*The Free-Church will live,*" said a Foreign brother, "*the Free Church will live ; for, THE LIFE is in her !*"

---

THE  
FREE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. I.]      SATURDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1843.      [No. 8.

I.—LECTURES ON THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, &c.

SUPPLEMENT OR APPENDIX II.—*Consideration of the causes which led to such contradictory judgments in the recent Church and State controversy in Scotland—These causes classified agreeably to Lord Bacon's division and arrangement of the idols of the mind—First class, viz. "IDOLS OF THE TRIBE," or the original dispositions and tendencies of human nature, illustrated—Second class, viz. "IDOLS OF THE DEN," or the peculiarities of individual constitutions, habits or professions, exemplified, more especially in the case of POLITICIANS OR STATESMEN, LAWYERS OR JUDGES—Third class, viz. "IDOLS OF THE MARKET," or the imperfections and abuses of language, such as, that the Church is a CREATURE of the State, the PRIDE and PRESUMPTION of interpreting statutes of the realm, the alleged COMPACT between Church and State, the MAJESTY and SUPREMACY of the law of the land, the asserted NOVELTY of the Church's claims, the declared INSINCERITY and INCONSISTENCY of the Church, the charge of PRIESTLY AMBITION and POPIISH TYRANNY, the clamour about SCHISM, the outcry about REBELLION—The fourth class, viz. "IDOLS OF THE THEATRE," or gratuitously assumed dogmas, and prevalent but unfounded theories, such as, the ERASTIAN theory, the LEGAL theory, the ANTI-ESTABLISHMENT theory, the PATRONAGE theory, the UNCHANGED LETTER OF THE LAW theory, the PRIESTLY or HIGH CHURCH theory, the ANTI-POPULAR theory, the INDIAN theory.—Concluding remarks.*

When calmly meditating, in this distant land of voluntary exile, on the ever-shifting phases of the infinitely diverse and contradictory judgments which have been called forth by the recent Church and State controversy in Scotland, the question has again and again recurred, What can be the cause or causes of such wondrous and interminable discordances? If all the opponents of the late constitutional and evangelical majority, in the Church Courts, could be supposed miraculously smitten with the distorting phrenzy of a new Babel confusion; or, if all could be supposed actuated by the malignant passions of envy, hatred, wrath, malice, and revenge; or, if all could be supposed animated by the selfish impulses of avarice, covetousness, love of carnal enjoyment, and ambition;—then, might the strange phenomena be at once accounted for. But, we dare not, in justice or in charity, assume the exclusive or general operation of such sinister

causes. In the solemnity of Apostolic language, we exclaim, "God forbid," that we should! That such or similar influences have prevailed to a greater or less extent, and in forms more or less mitigated, it would be useless to deny. But, it were equally preposterous to deny, that, in the motley ranks of opposition, there are honourable men, yea numbers of high minded and honourable men, who could not and would not, consciously or knowingly, advocate ought which they believed to be inequitable, unconstitutional, or unscriptural.

What, then, may have been the predominant cause or causes of such endless variance and discord? For the sake of method or convenient arrangement they may be reduced to those *four* great classes of blinding prejudice or prepossession, so happily described by Lord Bacon under the designation of "*Idols*." Lands, which had got rid of the grosser idols of superstition, long continued, and continue still, to groan under the tyranny of idols of another sort—idols, which have usurped the place of truth in every domain of knowledge and principle, as much as the false deities of the Heathen usurped the throne of ~~THE~~ *TRUE* God in the understanding and the hearts of the creatures, whom he has formed by his power, and sustained by his unmeasured bounty. The "idols," the noble author defines to be, "the false notions of the mind which take such deep root therein, and so possess it, that truth can hardly find entrance; and even when it is entered, these will again rise up, and grow troublesome, unless men guard against them with all possible diligence."

But, such idols are not obstructive of the progress of the sciences only; they are equally obstructive of right views in every department to which human thought can extend, or by which human feeling can be affected. They enter just as largely into the pith and marrow of the recent Church and State controversy in Scotland, as they ever did, into the heart and substance of the mighty conflicts between the ancient or Aristotelian, and the modern or Baconian Philosophy. Oh, then, for the rise of another Bacon, in the distracted firmament of our Church and nation,—endowed like with subtilty of wit to detect the minutest differences, and with comprehensiveness of genius to seize and embrace the largest harmonies and widest correspondences of things;—possessed, therefore, of spiritual and ecclesiastical sagacity, to lay bare the inner sanctuary of men's souls; strip them of their natural and acquired disguises; and bring them forth with unveiled and purged vision to the contemplation of pure truth!

I. The first class of idols, or "*idols of the Tribe*," are those which have their "foundation in the whole tribe or race of mankind;" in other words, the *original dispositions and tendencies of human nature*. In this view of it, the mind of every man is declared to be "like a mirror, which, mixing its own nature with the nature of things, distorts or perverts them;"—or, "like a glass, with its surface differently cut, so as differently to receive, reflect, and refract the rays of light that fall upon it." This class includes the countless host of the prejudices, prepossessions, and antipathies of the human mind—its mistakes arising from ignorance, narrowness, or contractedness—the tincture and bias of its predominant likings, tastes, and affections. The existence, the prevalence, the universality of these and such like influences, and their powerful and incessant operation, as disturbing forces,—in blinding the understanding and hurrying it along an orbit of fitful irregularities—must be regarded as too palpable to need any lengthened illustration. Let us glance at a few, with special reference to the recent Church and State controversy in Scotland.

Except in times of downright persecution, the Church had been established since the earliest period of the Reformation. Venerable in itself, it

had for ages been justly venerated. It had long been the nation's chiefest glory, because its most characteristic, and immeasurably, its most useful institution. To separate from it, therefore, on almost any grounds, or to see it separated from the State which had nourished it with its temporal bounties, could not but occasion a conflict of emotion and mental struggle, of no ordinary intensity. How must all the conservative energies of our nature have been stirred up in favour of its continuance on almost any terms! How must the judgments of men have been warped by prejudices and prepossessions on the side of prolonged existence, and by consequent antipathies against all change!—prejudices, prepossessions, and antipathies arising from early and inveterate associations—from transmitted habits of thought and hereditary usages—from reverence for ancient forms and prevailing modes of manifesting cherished principles—from the mere circumstance of being led, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, to become the frequent advocate of the established regime—from the incidental inoculation of partial or one sided notions—from the seeds of indelible impressions, sown casually in infancy and childhood, or designedly by the more systematic processes of education—from the self confirmatory effects of personal antagonism—from local, provincial, or ancestral peculiarities of feeling, sentiment, and practice—from specialties of natural talent, character, or temperament, connected with indolence, or ease, or inertness, or dread of change—from hasty observation untempered by discriminating reflection—from the vacillations of indecision and the laggart hebetude of over cautiousness—from the apprehensions of mistaken prudence and the wrong headedness of a selfish and interested partizanship—from the alluring influences that emanate from whatever is associated with rank, wealth, dignity, State recognition, and Royal favours!

Now, that every prejudice, or prepossession, arising from whatever source, is injurious to the cause of truth, free inquiry, and sound knowledge, needs no proof. Involving, as it does in every instance, the entertainment of a "decided opinion before due examination or upon insufficient inquiry," how can it be otherwise? Experience but too sadly proves that it exerts a spreading and infectious influence. It is like the little leaven that soon leaveneth the whole lump. It is like the fly in the Apothecary's ointment. It is like the coloured thread inserted into a tulip root, which is said to be "sufficient permanently to inoculate the flower which it produces with the particular colour." Experience also teaches that it is fraught with an assimilative and dispersive influence. It acts like a *nidus* or first *nucleus*, about which, as in the formations of the crystal or other aggregate, "every surrounding particle and atom which is of the same nature forms itself after the same pattern and structure, and to the exclusion of all matters which are of an opposite character." And where it cannot assimilate, it eventually outgrows and stifles whatever is of a contrary or uncongenial nature—or, what is, in effect, the same, repels and excludes it.

Such being the spreading and infectious—the assimilative and repulsive powers of prejudice or prepossession;—and such having been the united confederacy of prejudices and prepossessions marshalled in dense array on the side of those, who, at all hazards and on any conditions, resolved to uphold the existing Establishment;—need we wonder at the horrid din, discord, and confusion, with which they succeeded in replenishing a weary and distracted land? Again, "the light of the understanding," says Bacon, "is not of the nature of a dry or pure light, but drenched in the will and affections, which tinge and vitiate the intellect, in ways innumerable and often imperceptible." Is it not notorious that what men wish or desire to be, they are most readily inclined, with or without evidence, to believe as right and true? Now, how many natural affections, tastes, propensities, and active impulses must have conspired to lead all Church-



men strongly to wish or desire the continuance of the many civil and temporal advantages derived by the Establishment, from its connection with the State? And, then, what a teeming variety of private, peculiar, and *idiosyncratical* feelings and affections! There is on the part of ministers, a natural and strong attachment to homes that have been endeared by the most delightful recollections, and to spheres of labour on which they have witnessed the descent of "the dew of Hermon"—issuing in the verdure and the fruits of righteousness. There is, on the part of the people, a reverential cleaving to the sacred edifice in which they and their fathers have communed and worshipped—surrounded as it usually is with the hallowed dust of many generations. There is often a passionate fondness for the scenery of favourite localities, which, whether sternly wild or softly beautiful, monotonously tame or grandly sublime, has been linked with associations that may be fraught with charms at once inexpressible and incommunicable. There is the energetic instinct or principle of self love which magnifies difficulties and dangers, estimates temporal sacrifices beyond their proper value; blinds men to their own faults and failings; impels them to measure every thing else by their own narrow standard; cherishes in them the doating persuasion that their own little knowledge is a sufficient ground for the most dogmatic judgments; flatters them into the belief that their own contracted views and opinions are indisputably the wisest and the best; incites them often to prize and pursue the means rather than the end, or to prosecute right ends by wrong means; and, to crown all, is ever sensitively alive to the irrationality and folly of relinquishing, for light considerations, or any considerations at all, the overflowing cup of providential favours in actual possession. There is the pride, the ambition, and the vanity which will not brook the humiliation of defeat and cannot afford the generosity of apologetic confession. There is the envy, the jealousy, the hatred, or the dread of successful rivals, or competitors, or opponents. There is the displeasure, the irritation, the bitterness, the wrath, excited by painful and protracted controversies. There are the antipathies and aversions evoked by the heated spirit of partizanship, which spread havoc and confusion throughout the domain of reason and judgment, like the tortuous and curling billows that are raised by blustering winds let loose on the bosom of the tranquil deep. There is the blindfold zeal and rage that flow from deep, deplorable, consummate ignorance of the subject. Above all, there is the rooted dislike, the rancorous enmity of the unregenerate heart—the unrenewed nature—against any plan, scheme, organization, or revival that is designed to wage more effectual war against all carnality, worldliness, formalism, and godless indifferentism;—designed, to let in the light of heaven into the naturally beclouded understandings of men, and the grace of heaven into their naturally hardened hearts;—designed, to erect temples of piety in the bosom of every family and transplant them as monuments of glory to the New Jerusalem. And is not the coalition and muster of such a host of the strongest affections and impulses of the natural man enough and more than enough to bribe or lull asleep the conscience that ought to sit as an ever vigilant observer and impartial judge;—enough, and more than enough, to infect and bias the understanding that ought ever to admit and pass the pure light of evidence and truth unrefracted and undistorted;—enough, and more than enough, to throw a false and delusive colouring over the very facts, events, and actual phenomena themselves?

II. The next class of Idols, or "*Idols of the Den*," are those which arise from *peculiarities of individual constitutions, habits, or professions*. "When" says Bacon, "men, fondly addicted to the study of *particular sciences*

afterwards take to Philosophy and general contemplations, they are apt to wrest and corrupt them by an admixture of their former fancies and conceits." This profound remark he himself illustrates by adducing the signal example of Aristotle "who made his natural philosophy such an absolute slave to his logic as to render it contentious and almost useless. From a few experiments of the crucible, the tribe of Alchemists have constructed a fantastical and limited philosophy. And so Dr. Gilbert, after he had, with immense labour, prosecuted his magnetical studies, immediately framed a philosophical system in accordance with his favourite subject."

"Every different kind of study, profession, or occupation," says another shrewd observer, "has a tendency to establish a particular law or habit of mind, which while it is peculiarly conducive to the successful practice of it, operates as a prejudice, in giving its own character and colouring to all other truth, and to the complexion of nature. Things are thus seen through a distorting medium; subjected to the measure of an artificial and, therefore, false standard; approved of, if they assume the imparted features; repelled, if they do not." Every thing is "seen and estimated in one single point of view, and with reference to one idea or object." Hence the remark, that "the carpenter wants to build the wall of wood, the currier of leather—that the mechanic talks of the stomach as of a mill; the brewer as of a vat; the cook as of a stewpan;—whereas, as observed by Dr. Hunter, it is neither a mill, a stewpan, nor a vat, but a stomach."

Than this tendency, there is not a mere prolific source of error in the human mind. Exemplifications of its working may be drawn from every domain of truth and every department of human research. Cicero tells us of a musician, who, when asked, what the *soul* was, promptly replied, that it was *harmony*. "He knew not," remarks the orator, "how to leave behind the principles of his art." In like manner, it is related of Plato's disciples, that they had been "bred up altogether in *arithmetic*, and the knowledge of *numbers*." And hence, it came to pass, that "when *afterward* they directed their studies to the knowledge of *nature* or *moral philosophy*, wheresoever they walked they still feigned to themselves *somewhat like unto numbers*; the *world*, they supposed, was framed out of *numbers*; *rulers* and *kingdoms* and *commonwealths* they thought stood by *numbers*;—*number*, with them, was *sole principle and creator of every thing*."

Darwin, who had a distaste for the more abstract sciences, became such an enthusiast in his *physical* inquiries into the economy of *vegetation* and the laws of *organic* life, that, when he came to treat of the functions of spirit, he *materialized* them all. In his definition of it, an *idea* is a "*contraction or motion or configuration of the fibres which constitute the immediate organ of sense*!" And the universal prepossession in favour of the *immaterialism* of *ideas* or *thought*, he coolly compares to "the stories of ghosts and apparitions which have so long amused the credulous!" In fact, in his "*den*" of idol-worship, the soul is a sort of Botanical product, or peculiar species of vegetable!! In the same way, Dr. Hooke, who had a passion for *mechanics*, and especially for the art of *watch-making*, carries with him his horological predilections into the department of Spirit. With him, too, ideas are *material*,—being either formed out of the *brain* itself, or conveyed thither, from external objects by the senses, acting as *collectors* and *carriers*. Their repository is in the brain, where they are carefully lodged and duly preserved, as they are formed, one after the other, in succession, in the chronological order of their formation. There is, as it were, "a *continued chain of ideas coiled up* in the repository of the brain, the *first end* of which is farthest removed from the centre, where the ideas are formed, and the *other end* is always at the centre, being the last idea formed." So that the soul is constructed, with wheels, pivots, coiled chains, and centres, like a *chronometer*

or watch. In fact, in Hooke's "den" of idol-worship, the soul is a sort of chronometrical formation, or peculiar species of watch!! And so with all other exclusive physicists. With certain Statical experimentalists, what are ideas, but vibrations or vibratuncles of the brain? With certain Chemists, what are they, but the sparkling effervescence of animal spirits, when brought into contact and commixtion with the medullary matters of the nervous system? With certain Electricians, what are they, but the sparks emitted from the grand galvanic battery of the brain?—And so, with many other dreamers, each dozing or speculating in his own little "den," as if it were the whole world of intelligible being!

The same tendency manifests itself in every other department. How often is it that when professed cultivators of one branch of science apply incidentally to other branches, they manifest an aptitude to render them all conformable to their favourite studies and pursuits? In like manner, when professed Philosophers apply to Theology, or professed Theologians apply to Philosophy, how apt are the former to reduce religion to dry, technical, scientific forms and blend it with philosophical crudities;—and how apt the latter, "to force schemes of science or philosophy out of the reluctant materials of religion? Hence it is, that, from the wild mixture of divine things with human, arise not only phantastical philosophies, but heretical religions." In the Platonizing School of Alexandria, Christianity was made to assume a form which would seem to indicate that it was partly a development and partly a modification of the Platonic Philosophy. In the Spiritualizing School of Hutchinson, a few popular expressions in the books of Genesis and Job, become the mint where all Natural Philosophy may be fabricated. In the Geometrizing School of Jackson, we are favoured with the "Mathematical principles of Theology, and Geometrical demonstrations of the existence of God," after the model of Euclid, with his definitions, axioms, propositions, theorems, and lemmas. In the sensualizing school of David Hume, every thing is so reduced to the test of a *gross, sensible experience*, that he even tells us, he "saw no reason, why two mathematical lines might not intersect each other in more than one point, because two such lines having never been made, *the theory could not be proved by experience.*" In the transcendentalizing school of Emanuel Kant, we are taught how the *a priori* notions and operations of the human mind must affect, and modify and mould into adapted forms, not only all science and philosophy, but even super-natural revelation itself!

Such being the strength and universality of the peculiar bias, tendency, or disposition produced by an *exclusive devotion* to a particular profession, or the "Idolatry of the Den," it will serve to diminish our surprize, while it may satisfactorily account for some of the strange phenomena exhibited during the growth and progress of the recent Church and State controversy in Scotland. In the introduction of the first Lecture of the present course, will be found a passing glance at some of the practical effects of this species of idolatry. Our present remarks will be confined to a notice of its effects on the two most important classes that had to do with the ultimate decision of the controversy, viz., the *Politicians or Statesmen*, and the *Lawyers or Judges* of the land.

If, as has been truly remarked, all other studies and sciences, all worldly objects and pursuits, have a tendency more or less to unfit us for what is spiritual;—if the anatomist, the geologist, the mathematician, the physiologist, the chemist, and even the moral philosopher, have all "the law of their minds in some degree unfitted, by the peculiar use and exercise to which they habitually abandon them, to form perfectly just and correct estimates upon the topics of religion;"—if "too great and exclusive

devotedness to any objects of temporal concern, and of a material nature, militates against a true comprehension of religion, and furnishes the sources of idolatry—there being nothing so peculiar and exclusive, as compared with all worldly and temporal concerns, as the pure mind and spirit of religion;—how can Politicians and Lawyers,—whose very business it is, supremely if not exclusively, to occupy themselves with the *temporal*, the *civil*, the *material* affairs of men,—expect to escape the taint and contagious influence of their own *professional habits of thought and action*, when they come to discuss or settle matters *purely spiritual*, or *ecclesiastical*? They would be less than human, if they expected to escape; and more than human, if they actually did. But it is not possible. The moulding, transforming, and obscuring influence of their peculiar profession, like “the smoke and tarnish” of the Alchemists, will accompany them, into whatever department they enter,—more especially a department so remote from their ordinary habitudes as that of pure religion—and cast its blighting shadow on every object within its reach.

What is the *chief aim* of the Politician or Statesman by profession?—Is it not the possession of *power*;—power, *temporal* or *secular*, *civil* or *political*? Possessed of such power, how does he wield it?—Is it not for purposes of legislation, rule, and government? Wielding such power for such ends, what habits of mind and action does he inevitably contract?—Are they not the habit of dogmatically announcing his opinions—the habit of imperiously dictating to all within the sphere of his governance—the habit of issuing his authoritative commands—the habit of expecting implicit and unconditional obedience? Thus, he lives, and moves, and has his being amid the elements of a power, that is of the earth, earthy;—a power, the modifications, uses, and appliances of which constitute the very exercise of his intellectual nature—the very nutriment of his moral and social state—the very enjoyment and support of his active and practical life. Such being the case, it must fare with him as with Cicero's Musician, Plato's disciples, the Darwins of Physiology, the Hookees of Horology, the Jacksons of Mathematics, the Humes of Sensible Experience, the Kants of transcendentalism, together with the whole tribe of Anatomists, Chemists, Physicists, and other “Idolators of the Den.” He cannot,—when he moves out of his own favourite and familiar sphere, and betakes himself to other themes and more “general contemplations,”—he cannot wholly divest himself of those principles and habits which have grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength—moulding and shaping his modes of conception—regulating and determining his modes of action—and wresting and corrupting with their own peculiar fancies and conceits every new subject of intellectual, moral, or religious import. Speak to him of the Supreme Spiritual Headship of Christ in the Church;—he cannot understand this, apart from the supreme civil headship of the Monarch in the State. Speak to him about an independent power of jurisdiction, rule, and government in the Church;—he cannot understand the compatibility of this with the paramount jurisdiction, rule and government of the State, consisting, representatively, of King, Lords, and Commons. Speak to him about the supremacy of the Statute Books and recorded laws and ordinances of Christ;—he cannot understand how all this is reconcilable with the supremacy of the Statute Book and the recorded laws and ordinances of the realm. Speak to him of the prior and superior obligation of allegiance to Christ as King of kings as well as the sole Head of His Church and only King in Zion;—he cannot understand how this can consist with what he holds as the exclusive obligation of allegiance to the earthly sovereign. In a word, towards every thing secular, civil, or political he is Argus-eyed; towards every thing spiritual, religious, or ecclesiastical he is mole-eyed. Or rather the inveterate principle

and habits contracted in the former department, he carries along with him into the latter; and, so doing, he sees every thing therein through a distorting and discolouring medium. How, then, can his judgments be otherwise than erroneous—his decisions, otherwise than unjust?

In this a visionary and fanciful, or speculative dream? Would to God that it were!—No; it is a sad and a sober reality. All this, and much more, has been fully exemplified by British Statesmen, in the recent Church and State controversy in Scotland. Their blunderings, misconceptions, and misunderstandings have been endless, and nameless. From the first, they either would not, or could not, view the great questions that had been raised through any other medium save the dusty and the blinding one, of secular politics. But though we have now endeavoured to account, or even frame an apology, for their fatuous conduct, in this respect, on the only principles that seem consistent with their assumed integrity and honour, such account or apology can in no wise serve to justify their blindness, or detract from the egregiousness of their misapprehensions, or rectify their glaring mistakes, or palliate the untowardness of their unconstitutional decisions, or neutralize, or arrest the disastrous consequences that may be destined to flow therefrom.

At the very outset, the previous principles and habits, acquired in the "Den" of carnal politics, led them to confound the essentially distinct natures of the Church or kingdom of Christ, and the States or kingdoms of this world. The claim of independent *spiritual* jurisdiction and government in the Church of Christ, they at once unceremoniously repudiated—ignorantly denouncing it as an "*imperium in imperio*," altogether incompatible with the *civil* rights and liberties of the subject—disdainfully casting away from them the doctrine of Christ's Headship, the supremacy of His laws and rights of allegiance. But, though the eyes of Statesmen could not be opened to perceive the vital differences between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdoms of this world, it is well that others should have their eyes open, that they may the better apprehend the greatness of their blunders. For this end, a few of the more obvious differences may here be noted. The sovereign Lords of all earthly kingdoms are men of like passions with ourselves. The sovereign Lord of the Kingdom of grace is Jesus Christ, the incarnate Saviour, who "in the beginning was with God, and was God." The subjects of this world's kingdoms are the visible persons or bodies of men. The subjects of the Kingdom of grace are the invisible souls or spirits of men. The end and objects of earthly kingdoms are the varied temporal interests of men. The ends and objects of the Kingdom of grace are the spiritual and eternal interests of men. The authority of earthly princes extends only to the bodies and outward physical acts of men—silencing their tongues, binding their limbs, confining their persons, or destroying the material fabric altogether. The authority of the heavenly Prince extends to the inward spiritual movements of their souls—setting up or establishing his imperial throne and government in their understandings and wills, their hearts and consciences. The laws and edicts of earthly princes are a strange and incongruous assemblage of the dictates of autocrats, the rescripts of emperors, the decrees of senates, the decisions of judges, the acts of Parliaments, the froth and scum thrown down by tradition, and the immemorial usages of the people—and all alike fluctuating, fallible, and temporary. But the laws and edicts of Jehovah-Jesus, flow direct from the one Fount and Springhead of all creation, all arrangement, all harmony, all law; and are all alike unerring unchangeable, necessary, and eternal. The kingdoms of this world are defined by their local boundaries and recognized by the use of distinctive devices, marks, or badges of an *external* character, such as national flags, ban-

ners, standards, and armorials. The Kingdom of grace is circumscribed by no limits but those of the globe; and its distinguishing notes and marks are those of the hidden man of the heart, the incorruptible beauties of faith and love and other Christian graces which do manifest their reality in fruits of righteousness. The kingdoms of this world trust much, for their continued maintenance and support, to outward pomp and grandeur and shew and brilliant fetes, which strike the multitude with awe and superstitious reverence. The Kingdom of the Messiah banishes all such outward pomp and magnificence as idolatry and pollution—as utterly unsuited to its true dignity, foreign to its loftiness of spirit, and repugnant to its divine sublimity of design. The kingdoms of this world, originally gotten by the sword, are still upheld by the same—all their penal sanctions being concentrated therein. The Kingdom of grace is erected, “not by the sword, but by the spirit; not by violence, but by love; not by striving, but by yielding; not by fighting, but by dying;”—its appropriate penal sanctions being, the stings of conscience, the wrath of an unseen God, the horrors of perdition. Once more, in the kingdoms of this world, human glory is diminished, in proportion as it is shared by others. Those who enjoy it, therefore, are limited in number. Few are admitted to the honours of the court; and fewer still into the confidence of the sovereign. But, it is not so in the Kingdom of grace. Here, divine glory is only enhanced by the freeness and the fullness of its communications. Every subject of this happy realm is a courtier—yea, a prince—yea, a king. And no one is invidiously shut out from the secrets of the Royal Court, or from the consultations of the Royal Council.

Such being the marked differences, yea palpable contrarieties between the Church or Kingdom of grace and the kingdoms of this world, it would be almost incredible, had not sad experience proved the reverse, that even secularized Statesmen should blunder so egregiously as, in their “*Den idolatry*,” to confound them. If any one, in playfulness or in gravity, had applied the hackneyed and time-worn expression, “*imperium in imperio*,” in order to illustrate the *ambiguity* or *double meaning* of words—it would be all very well. But to apply it seriously to the present subject, by way of argument, seems to proceed on the assumption, that it will either find or make all men intellectual imbeciles. If, in the expression, “Let the dead bury their dead,” we understand the term “dead” in its *one literal* meaning, then does it propound what is not merely incompatible with sense, but what is physically impossible. But if, as intended, the term “dead” be understood in its two fold sense of *spiritual* and *natural* death, then does it set forth a duty which is not only possible, but tersely pregnant with significance. So with the expression “*imperium in imperio*”—empire within empire—government within government—rule within rule. If the terms *imperium* and *imperio* be understood in *one* identical *literal* sense, then does it exhibit that which, if not physically impossible, is at least incompatible with the peace and order of society. But if, when applied to a subject like the present, it *must* be understood in its *two fold* sense of *spiritual* and *civil*, what becomes of the alleged incompatibility? It instantly evanishes. For what, in that case, does it represent? What but this—that a *spiritual* rule or government exists within the territorial sphere and limits of a *civil* or *secular* rule and government? Where is the absurdity, or incongruity in this representation? In the constitution of man there are two natures—one nature within another. If both were corporeal—this statement would be absurd. But where is the absurdity in saying that the immaterial nature or soul dwells and reigns within the material nature or body? In England, there are Railway Companies, Astronomical, Geological, and other Societies without number. Now have not all of these—their directors, their office-bearers, their peculiar government, and rules? In all these cases, then, we have an “*imperium in imperio*.”

But how absurd to talk of the Railway, or Astronomical, or Geological, or any similar "*imperium*" being inconsistent with the ends and objects of the State "*imperium*?" How would the man be covered with derision who could gravely talk of the Rule and Government of such Companies or Societies being irreconcilable with the Rule and Government of the great corporate Civil Societies or State? And is it not vastly more preposterous to talk of the Rule and Government of a *spiritual* Society or Church being inconsistent with the Rule and Government of a *temporal* Society or State? In the case of the former Societies, their objects, like those of the State, are physical, and material, and earthly; yet the absurdity of any real collision of interests is too glaring to be tolerated. Whereas, in the case of the latter Society, its objects, unlike those of the State, are spiritual, immaterial, heavenly; and yet the reality of a collision of interests between them, must be depicted with senatorial gravity, and forced athwart the reclaiming reason and lacerated common sense of men!—Verily, if the Church were a Kingdom like unto earthly kingdoms—its King, like unto earthly kings—its Government, like unto earthly governments—its jurisdiction and laws, like unto earthly jurisdiction and laws—its sanctions, ends, aims, and purposes, like unto earthly sanctions, ends, aims, and purposes:—then, and then only, could this be true. But when kingdom and king, government and jurisdiction, sanction and laws, ends and purposes, are not only unlike in degree, but utterly unlike, yea, diametrically opposite in kind;—the one being all faith; the other, all sense;—the one, all spiritual; the other, all secular;—the one, all invisible; the other, all visible;—the one, all temporal; the other, all eternal;—then, does it seem "confusion worse confounded," to blend and interfuse things so perfectly heterogeneous—such confusion, indeed, as would delight the "Anarch old" himself, next whom—

Rumour sat and chance

And Tumult and Confusion, all embroiled,

And Discord, with a thousand various mouths."

This amazing error of our British Statesmen was precisely that of Pilate, the Heathen Judge and Governor. In his startled ears, the terms "King and kingdom" sounded ominous. All his notions on the subject were essentially carnal, secular, earthly. And in his impervious heathen understanding, not a single crevice could be found, through which the faintest glimmer could be admitted, of what was meant by *spiritual* King and *spiritual* Kingdom. He knew not, and could not be made to know any other king than Cæsar, any other kingdom than that of imperial Rome. And under the predominance of this blinding confusion respecting the imaginary bugbear of an "*imperium in imperio*," he crucified the Lord of glory—as if guilty of treason and rebellion, by the confession that "that he was a King, and that, for this end he was born!" How strange, how ominously strange, that, in the 19th century of the Christian era, British and professedly Christian Statesmen and Rulers, should fall blind-fold into the fatal error of the Roman, and avowedly heathen governor;—yea, should persist in their error, till they succeeded, so far as they were concerned, in crucifying, if not the Lord of Glory Himself, at least, his cause and testimony as hitherto nationally upheld within the ancient kingdom of Scotland.\*

\* British Statesmen, however, were far more inexcusable than the Roman Governor;—inasmuch as they were not merely nominal Christians, and had the Bible to correct their errors; but still more, inasmuch as they were British Statesmen, and had clear and peremptory *Statutes of the Realm*, to point out their mistakes—to confront, arraign, and condemn their misguided judgments.

But, it may be supposed, that, though *Statesmen*, in the heat and agitation of political partizanships, may see through hazy and turbid media, grave *judges*, wholly removed from the bustle and turmoil of all faction and of all business, cannot be similarly affected. Still, judges, are but *men*, of "like passions" with others; and, as such, are not beyond the influence of those laws that regulate the successions of our mental states and moral emotions, or that preside over and form the mental and moral habits, acquired in the course of professional life. Are long contracted habits so easily disintegrated and dissolved? Are old associations, biasses, or prejudices to be set aside at the bidding of our wills? Impossible. The man, who has been steeped and saturated in the peculiar aversions and predilections of party will, perhaps unconsciously to himself, be more or less the slave of their insidious and despotic dominance, all his days. The man who has been cast and fashioned in the mould of a peculiar and exclusive profession is sure, without, it may be, being aware of it, to carry along with him into any new department on which he enters, the "smoke and tarnish" of the furnace at which he has previously wrought.

The following is a brief notice of the *statutory evidence* as epitomized in a recent home pamphlet, which *establishes at once* THE EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION of the Church in *spiritual* matters, and the fact that the whole business of the collation or induction of ministers is regarded by the Legislature as falling within that exclusive jurisdiction:—

By the Act 1567, c. 7. "It is statute and ordained, that the examination and admission of ministers within this realm, be only in the power of the Kirk now openly and publicly professed within the same—the presentation of laic Patronages always reserved to the just and ancient Patrons." "And again, the appeal from the judgments of the inferior courts, refusing to receive and admit the presentee, is to be taken to the "General Assembly of the haill realme, be quhome the cause being decyded, sall take end as they decern and declair."

The Act 1592, c. 116, intituled "Ratification of the Liberty of the true Kirk," which, among other acts, abrogated the Act 1584 (by which the king was made supreme in spiritual matters), declares, in reference to that act, "that it shall no wise be prejudicial, nor derogate any thing to the privilege, that God has given to the spiritual office-bearers in the Kirk, concerning heads of religion, matters of heresy, excommunication, collation or deprivation of ministers, or any siklike essential censours, specially grounded, and havand warrant of the Word of God." The same statute goes on to ordain "all presentations to benefices to be direct to the particular presbyteries in all time cumming, with full power to give collation thereupon; and to put ordour to all matters and causes Ecclesiastical, within their bounds, according to the discipline of the Kirk."

By the Act 1690, c. 5, ratifying the Confession of Faith, it is statute and ordained, in the words of that Confession, "that there is no other head of the Church, bat the Lord Jesus Christ" (Ch. 25, § 6); that, "as king and head of his Church, he hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate," (Ch. 30 § 1); "that it belongeth to synods and councils, to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his Church; which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in His Word," (Ch. 31, § 3); and "that the civil magistrate may not assume to himself the power of the keys, (Ch. 23, § 3.)

From the above quoted statutes, these conclusions appear to be undeniable:—That *ecclesiastical authority* is regarded by the *statute law* of Scotland, as an ordinance of God, to be revered and obeyed in all things consonant to the Word of God; that it can be competently possessed and exercised *only* by the office-bearers of Christ's Church, and in accordance with his revealed mind and will; that it is legitimately put forth in laying down rules for the better government of the Church; that no *secular or civil authority* whatsoever may lawfully interfere with its outgoings, or control its exercise; and that especially, in the whole matter of ordaining to the holy office of the ministry, and intrusting with the pastoral charge of souls, it is *supreme and independent*, and may not be intermeddled with, by the governing power of the country itself,—the "civil magistrate," in the highest sense of the term—and far less by an inferior civil court, instituted for the sole purpose of "doing justice in civil actions."



It fares with Lawyers and Judges as with Cicero's Musician, Plato's disciples, and all other "idolators of the Den." It is not possible for them, any more than for others, wholly to shake themselves loose from those professional principles and habits, in which they have been nurtured and exclusively disciplined. For the law they were in a manner born; in the law they were brought up; the law has been their chief and predominant study. When, therefore, they come to judge of *spiritual and divine* things, which have in them a comprehensiveness and expansive energy that overleap all man-made boundaries, they cannot, even then, divest themselves of the presence of *Law*. Their fancy still broods and hovers in the region of *law*. Their likings and preferences still cleave to *law*. Their understandings are still cramped and fettered by considerations of *law*. *Law, law—dry, technical human law*—is above, beneath, and round about them. They feel;—it is *law*. They imagine;—it is *law*. They think;—it is *law*. They dream;—it is *law*. They pronounce solemn judgment;—it must smack and savour of *law*. They hear;—it is with the ear of *law*. They see;—it is with the eye of *law*. They read;—it is with the organs of *law*. They handle;—it is with the fingers of *law*. *Law*, like Socrates' demon, never leaves them. *Law*, like the ogre or spectre of superstition, ever haunts them. *Law*, like the man of the mountain, in oriental romance, still cleaves to them. *Law*, like the echo, is the rebound of all their thoughts, imaginations, and desires. *Law*, like the encompassing atmosphere, besets all their paths and imposes its pressure on all the movements of their mental and moral being.

The narrowing and contracting influence of the "Idol," *law*, even in *civil* matters, when these involve an extension or enlargement of popular rights and liberties, or new and improved applications of old and venerated principles, has often been noticed. "The Lawyer," says one, "being principally versed in established rules and precedents, is devoted to *old institutions and practices*, and in general *adverse to improvement or change*." "A Lawyer," says another, "in putting a *restrictive* construction on a law involving popular rights, may be quite free from any intentional prejudice or partiality; but he will not appear so in the eye of the public, who will impute to purpose what may have belonged to *professional habits*. It has been uniformly seen that popular privileges have dwindled under the *interpretation of judges*; and whether this effect be the consequence of a *bias*, or of the *rule of strict construction*, certain it is that when the fact appears again in new instances involving party interests, it will expose the judges to the most injurious and discreditable imputations." And if, even in the adjudication of *civil* cases, involving popular rights or great general principles, the narrowing and limiting influence of *legalism* strongly manifests itself and operates injuriously;—how much more may it be expected to do so in matters purely *spiritual and ecclesiastical*—matters, therefore, so utterly *foreign to their own peculiar and distinctive professional sphere*—matters, so wholly beyond the ken of their *ordinary contracted vision*?

It is on these principles, or such as these, that, without for a moment impeaching the high honour, or sense of even-handed justice, or moral integrity, of the civil judges of the land, we would satisfactorily account for their *singular liability to aberration of judgment* in deciding purely *spiritual and ecclesiastical questions*. It is on these principles, or such as these, that we would frame a *logical apology* for many of the revolting decisions, and still more revolting remarks and reasonings, of some of the Court of Session Lords and House of Peers Law Lords, in the great controversy which has recently rent the established Church of Scotland asunder. It is only on these principles, and as a marvellous exhibition of the reality and pernicious influence of the idolatry of the "Den," that we can at all logically account for the otherwise

inexplicable and all but incredible profanity of a Christian Judge, who, from the Bench of the Supreme Court of Civil Justice, could coolly pronounce the doctrine of the Headship of Christ *an absurdity*—and deposition from the ministry, in the name of Jesus, *blasphemy*!

III. The *third* class of idols, or "*Idols of the Market*," are those connected with the imperfections and abuses of *language*, the medium of communication and intercourse between man and man. "Men," says Bacon, "are associated by means of language." Errors, therefore, which arise from the abuses and imperfections of words are called "*idols of the Forum or Market*," since it is through speech, that men carry on mutual commerce and dealings. Now, "words are imposed according to the capacity or conceptions of the vulgar; whence a false and improper application of them wonderfully obstructs the understanding. For, though men believe that their reason governs words, it also happens that words retort and reflect their force upon the understanding; yea, absolutely do violence to it, put all things in confusion, and lead men away to idle controversies and subtilties without number." Idols, which words impose on the understanding, are, according to Bacon, of two kinds, "as being either the names of things which have no existence; or the names of things that do exist, but whose names are confused, ill-defined, and rashly and unskilfully abstracted from things." Of the *former* kind he notices, as examples, the terms "fortune," "primum mobile" or first mover, "the orbit" (supposed to be material) of the 'planets,' "the crystalline sphere, &c. &c." Of the *latter* kind, he specifies such names of action as, "corruption," "generation," "change," such names of qualities as "gravity," "levity," "rarity," "density &c. &c."

To these, if necessary, we might add terms without number, from the vocabularies of all written languages, which have occasioned infinite mistakes, misconceptions, and debates. Think of the interminable discussions and controversies raised by the "sensible" and "intelligible species," the "occult qualities," the "substantial forms," the "ideas," the "plenums," the "monads," the "plastic matter," the "atoms" and all the other verbal apparatus of the ancient schools of Philosophy! Think of the wranglings, the disputations, aye, and sometimes, the wars between potent states, excited by the "entities," "quiddities," and "hæccities;" the "quidlibets," "quodlibets," and quibuslibets;" the "universals a parte rei," and all the other verbal shibboleths of middle age Scholasticism! Think of the heats and acrimonies, the rivalries and hostilities that have been raised in times still more modern, by the imperfections or misapplications of terms, in every province of Literature, Science, and Theology—in every department of social, economic, or political well being!—setting the minds of myriads ajar, wasting ages of precious time, replenishing the libraries of all lands with piles of useless lumber, roughening the surface of the most polished circles of society, raising disturbance in the assemblies of the people, spreading confusion in the courts of justice, and canonizing errors in the very Halls of Legislation!

It was the keen perception of these manifold evils, which drew from the shrew and sagacious Paley the pointed remark that "the world is guided by names." And it was a practical conviction of the prodigious controversial value of a well stocked *armoury of hard names*, which, for lack of argument, in the recent mighty contentings in Scotland, compelled the enemies of the Church's spiritual freedom and independence to forge a ready made supply of such weapons, and plentifully distribute them for the purposes of aggressive warfare throughout the land. Boldly and bravely did they brandish the swords, and discharge the arrows of guilt-imputing words, stigmatising epithets, and odious expressions. "Breach of compact," "dishonesty

and inconsistency," "presumption and arrogance," "the Church, a creature of the State, or State corporation," "priestly ambition and Popish tyranny," "novelty of the non-intrusion principle," "schism," "the majesty and supremacy of the law of the land," "Law-breaking" and "rebellion;"—These and such like misleading and stigmatizing terms and expressions were profusely applied and pertinaciously reiterated, in spite of ten thousand protests against their relevancy or justness. By sheer dint of repetition, multitudes of the uninquiring and the indolent came at length to be magnetised into something like a vague and undefined belief—that they represented realities. Nor is this much to be wondered at, when we remember the proverb, respecting even the retailer of positive and admitted untruth, that "he has told it so often, that he believes it himself;" or, the similar remark of Burke, "Let us only suffer any person to tell us his own story, morning and evening, for twelve months together, and he will become our master."

But though, during the rage and excitement of controversy, numbers might be blinded and misled, by the ready invention and bold mis-application of odious terms and expressions, that is no reason why, at the distance of half the globe from the scene of warfare, we should allow ourselves to be blinded and misled too. Let us, then, look this bristling belligerent array of hard names and expressions fairly in the face; and see whether they can abide a fair and honest inspection. When Charles II. proposed it as a grave question, "Why a pail of water weighed no more after a fish was put into it than before?"—the reality of the fact, or phenomenon was at first taken for granted. Of course, all minds were on the alert, and all faculties strained, and all wits sharpened, to discover a solution. At length, the problem was solved, or rather, the knot cut in twain, by simply asking, "*Is it the fact?*" No. The reality of the fact having been covertly or tacitly assumed, the calling in question, or the denying the assumed fact saves all farther labour, and removes all farther difficulty. So it has been with the once venerable, but now exploded names and expressions of the Schoolmen of ancient and modern times. Bacon and his followers, having sagaciously ventured to put the question, Whether they represented any realities at all, or were merely assumed to do so?—it soon appeared that they were names or sounds, and names or sounds only,—coined or applied upon "phantastical conceits, and had no real things corresponding to them." So also, has it been in the late Church and State controversy in Scotland. The opponents of spiritual freedom and independence introduced and liberally echoed and re-echoed a multitude of cunningly-devised words and phrases, wherewith to bear down their antagonists, and cover them with odium and shame. Now, the slightest examination with a little coolness and candour, must suffice to prove, that all such terms and expressions are either founded on "phantastical conceits, or have no real things corresponding to them;" have been wholly misapplied, or involve egregious fallacies in the application. Let us shortly test some of those that have obtained the largest and most unenviable notoriety.

1st. It was asserted, (in ignorance we must in charity suppose) from the Bench, and subsequently reiterated to very nauseousness, that "the Church is a creature of the State, or a mere corporation created by it." The intended inference being, that the Church ought in all things implicitly to submit to the dictation of the State. Never was there a more strange or injurious misnomer. That it is so, the whole strain of the preceding Lectures must have served to demonstrate. The fallacy is transparent. The Church, viewed as a spiritual society deriving its being and constitution from Christ the Supreme Head, is a "creature of the State," exactly as the moral law is, and in no other sense, or way whatsoever! Now is the moral law, really

and truly a "creature of the State?"—No! the State simply *recognizes, approves, adopts, sanctions, and enforces* it—as already existing, *antecedently and independently* of the State. To its practical observances, the State may annex certain *temporal* immunities, and to its violation certain *temporal* penalties. These temporal immunities and penalties are the *creatures* of the State, as the annexation of them is its voluntary act. These the State may add to, subtract from, alter, modify, or abrogate altogether. But, the *moral* law itself, the State cannot,—cannot possibly—add to, subtract from, alter, modify, or abrogate, in any measure or degree. So it is with the Church of Christ. As the organization appointed by God himself for carrying out and perpetuating the economy of Redemption, she is altogether antecedent to, and independent of, any creative energy on the part of the State—every whit as much so, as the *moral law* itself. As in the case of the latter, the Church may be *recognized, approved, adopted, sanctioned, and upheld* by the State;—but, *created*, in any honest sense whatsoever, it never possibly could have been, nor ever possibly *can* be. The State may substantially signify its *sanction and adoption* of the *antecedently and independently* existing Church, by annexing *benefices* for the maintenance of its ministers and other *civil* immunities. These, and all such like *temporalities*, are verily the *creatures* of the State. These, it may add to, subtract from, alter, modify, or withdraw altogether, according to its good pleasure. But the *Church* itself, the *spiritually organized Society*, or *Body* of Christ, the State cannot—cannot possibly without the most daring impiety—add to, subtract from, alter, modify, or annul in any measure or degree.

The Church, then, as such, is in no sense the "creature of the State," or a "State corporation." In its constitution, laws, principles, rights, privileges, and powers, it is essentially distinct from, and essentially independent of the State. For all these, it has derived, not from the State, but from the Lord Jesus, as its only Head and King. The State has its constitution, powers, and authority for its own rightful ends;—the Church has its constitution, powers, and authority for its rightful ends. In this view of the subject, the Church and the State have been said to be *co-ordinate* in their jurisdiction, power, and authority. This is strictly true, when the term is properly understood. But, it is apt to convey a somewhat erroneous impression—as if the jurisdiction, power, and authority were *homogeneous*, or the *same in kind*, instead of being, as they truly are, *heterogeneous or intrinsically different in kind*. *Co-equal, co-ordinate*, or rather *di-ordinate* (if such a term may be coined) they are in jurisdiction and power, in the sense of *each being independent and supreme in its own proper sphere*;—the one, in the *temporal*; and the other in the *spiritual*. Friends and allies, therefore, of each other they may become;—creatures or vassals, never—without mutual degradation, involving civil or religious tyranny towards man, and not a little impiety towards God. The powers of Church and of State may be said to be *co-ordinate*, in somewhat the same way, as the different and opposite forces, centripetal and centrifugal, that maintain the earth in its orbit, may be said to be *co-ordinate*. Each is equal, independent, and supreme, in its own proper way, and for its own proper end. While such *co-equal, co-ordinate*, or *di-ordinate* supremacy subsists, in its own natural proportion and degree, there is *equilibrium, harmony, order*. But, let one be increased, and the other diminished, by the encroachment of one on the other, then must the earth rush into the sun or virtual annihilation, or fly off into empty space and instant destruction. The different and heterogeneous elements of fire and water may be said to be *supreme*, each in its own way and sphere. And while they remain so, all is calm and serene. But they are *immiscible*. Let, therefore, either begin to encroach on the province of the other, and

instantly commences a war which can only terminate with the destruction of one or other. So it is with the Church and the State. Their respective powers are independent and supreme—in their own respective legitimate spheres. Let them remain so, and all is peace. But, as they are heterogeneous and immiscible, let a war of encroachment commence, and be persevered in, and in the end, the Church must wholly swallow up the State, as Anti-Christian Rome once did; or the State must swallow up the Church, as autocratic Russia is now doing—to the infinite detriment of both. Oh, that British Rulers had been wise! That they had understood these things, and considered what the fatal issue of their inconsideration may be! Then, might the British State,—poised and upheld by the conspiring union and concord of righteous Statute law, supreme in things civil, and righteous Ecclesiastical law, supreme in things spiritual—be borne along, in its glorious career of improvement and prosperity, with as little deviation and irregularity as the earth in its orbit round the sun!

2d. But, the Church has been charged with “pride and presumption, assumption and arrogance,” in interpreting for herself those Statutes of the realm, to which she owes her recognition, ratification and establishment. “What right,” it has been demanded, “has the Church to interpret acts of Parliament? Will the General Assembly, consisting of ministers and elders but meagrely versed in law, and professedly a spiritual court, oppose her legal interpretations to the profound learning and knowledge of the great authorities of the Court of Session?” To this, we shall reply in the luminous words of the Rev. Mr. Lewis of Leith. “The question is a startling one,” says Mr. Lewis, “when cast into the general shape, Will the Church presume to interpret acts of Parliament? The proposal of it looks like an assumption of civil authority by the Church, and presumptuous opposition of her judgment to the legal functionaries of the land. To the charge of presumption we answer, assuredly it must be the duty of the Courts of the Church to read the law of their privileges, to endeavour to understand and form a clear and decided opinion of the obligations imposed upon them by statute, and of the interests committed to their care. How can they know the trust reposed in them by the State, unless they read the statute book—how can they discharge the trust faithfully, unless they read it with their own eyes? They cannot be responsible to the State in the exercise of their legal privileges, unless they be the independent interpreters of these. If they are to read through the spectacles of the Court of Session, the Court assumes the responsibility of the mal-administrations of the Church, and henceforth answers to the legislature for the procedure.

But is it really so presumptuous a thing to offer to interpret ecclesiastical statute law for ourselves? Is it knowledge too high for us? We are familiar indeed with the comparison of law to a vast and tangled forest, the windings and intricacies of which perplex the acutest minds, and bewilder the most experienced practitioners. The collections of civil, criminal, and revenue law are vast, voluminous, and unwieldy. We would not venture to touch them with one of our little fingers. Let lawyers bear the burden on their own shoulders—we envy not the load. But the collections of ecclesiastical statute law are neither voluminous nor perplexing. The statutes are few in number and of easy interpretation. A day's study would endow any minister of the Church with their treasures, and teach any of her members the solid basis of spiritual liberty laid by the pious industry and valour of our forefathers in the Church and State constitution of our land.

To the charge of assuming civil authority by interpreting acts of Parliament, we answer, We interpret only for ecclesiastical purposes, and should we pass our bounds, it belongs to the civil courts to interpret the same acts to extricate and maintain their civil jurisdiction. It is not to us that the

ecclesiastical statute law of the land is exclusively committed. It lies open to both courts—to the Church, to acquaint itself with its legal ecclesiastical privileges—to the Court of Session, to acquaint itself with the civil rights that are ratified and guarded in the same statutes. We grant the Church may be wrong in its interpretation,—we claim no infallibility,—but if we err in our own province, what statute of the realm, or what clause in any of the ecclesiastical statutes, empowers the Court of Session to set us right? The Criminal court may grievously err in its very serious interpretation of criminal law. It may sentence a man to transportation, it may go farther, and sentence him to execution, most unjustly. But dare the Court of Session interdict the sentence of execution, or interfere to set the Criminal Court right? If, indeed, a special clause were inserted in each ecclesiastical statute, constituting the Court of Session umpire in questions of doubtful interpretation, and binding the Church to abide by its decision, our legal right of interpretation would be extinguished, and the Church laid prostrate at the foot of a civil court. We should then be subjected to a lower humiliation than that of the servant of the State. The curse of Canaan would alight upon us, and we should become the servant of the servant of the State.

That the Court of Session possesses this over ruling power of interpreting ecclesiastical statutes, is the position now started and maintained by the party who dread the vindication of the spiritual independence of an Established Church, and who fear, above all things the practical exemplification of a Church in union with the State, yet independent and unfettered in her spiritual jurisdiction. They affect to pity the helplessness of our condition, and assure us with secret joy that it is irremediable. They tell us, that though Parliament ratify our spiritual independence, and constitute a pure union between Church and State, the Church must still be subject to the civil courts in the interpretation of the acts of union. If freed from every fetter by Parliament, she must still be bound by the civil court, nay, she is legally bound to receive and submit to the court's interpretation of acts of Parliament. The whole argument is founded upon a gratuitous assumption; we challenge its maintainers to point to the statute or clause in the statute of the realm, that conveys this power to the civil courts. If they cannot do this, their argument is an imagination,—it is refuted by the entire analogy of the other co-ordinate courts of the land.

But have we erred in so interpreting ecclesiastical statute laws? Are we chargeable with a novel and hitherto unheard of interpretation of these statutes of the realm? For the antiquity of our interpretation, we appeal to two authorities, who cannot be suspected of partiality in their testimony—the Court of Session, and the uniform procedure of the General Assembly. *We have been schooled by the decisions of the Court for 130 years, in our present construction of these statutes.* Up to the famous period of 1838, the decisions of the Court have been in accordance with this judgment. Is it wonderful then, we should be slow to unlearn the lesson of nearly a century and a half—that we should oppose the decisions of 130 years to the solitary unsupported decision of 1838—that we should arraign the present senators of the Court at the bar of their predecessors of many generations, re-consider and reverse their judgment?"

3rd. But, "the compact, the solemn compact between the Church and the State;"—has it not been broken? Is not "the Veto law contrary to the original compact between the Church and the State?" Such terms have been employed and such questions asked so frequently, that numbers might at length come to persuade themselves, and persuade others, that they meant something real. But, do they truly mean any thing real? Let us again

hear Mr. Lewis' admirable statement. "Where," asks he, "is the compact to be found? In what depository of ancient deeds and venerable records is it to be searched for? Who has ever seen the deed, the authentic deed, signed by the crown lawyers on the one hand, and the doctors of divinity of the realm on the other? We recently examined a fac-simile of the solemn compact or treaty of union between England and Scotland. Every one knows there is such a deed ratified by the signatures of the noble commissioners. Who ever read the signed and sealed treaty of union between the Church and State? On what occasion did the contracting parties meet,—who were the commissioners who prepared the terms of this august alliance? The occasion, the commissioners, the deed itself, are buried in profoundest obscurity,—history has proved treacherous in the record of those transactions, and drawn an impenetrable veil of obscurity over them. But to be serious. The "compact" is a pure fiction, a modern invention, a law phrase contrived to startle the Church from her propriety, and frighten her either into submission, or the resignation of her endowments." Let the history of the Church of Scotland be unfolded, and the page in her voluminous records be pointed to, where she acquiesced in the resignation of one spiritual privilege, or bound herself to one condition inconsistent with her independent government. We know of no conditions signed and sealed under her hand, by which she holds her benefices from the State. We know not one privilege she has consented to resign or exchange, for her civil emoluments or protection. Her integrity as a Christian Church she has ever maintained inviolate, and throughout each successive period of her history, her language to kings and rulers has been, that she must be taken, as a whole and entire Church of Christ, into union with the State, or not taken at all. In her past history, a usurping civil power has often assailed her freedom, and attempted to impose conditions subversive of her independence. But shall the aggressions of power upon the defenceless—shall the submission imposed by the stronger upon the weaker—be dignified by the name of a mutual compact? Such was the aggression of the law of patronage upon the Church in 1712. To invest that law with the imposing character of a contract between Church and State, is a grievous misrepresentation of its history—to call it by the name of a compact is a gross misnomer. To the present day, the Church has resented its imposition, refused its consent to it, protested against it as a usurpation, and yielded a sullen and reluctant obedience; nay more, it has proclaimed and stigmatized its imposition upon the Church, as one of the foulest violations of compact recorded in the annals of nations. The Church, violating the compact between Church and State, by her veto law! Read the treaty of union between the nations of England and Scotland, and say, whether the law restoring patronage was not a violation of a compact the most binding that ever was entered into between man and man, and violated in circumstances the most disgraceful, with such indecent haste, that the ink was scarcely dry with which the treaty was signed."

4th. Again, "the law," "the law of the land," "the majesty and supremacy of the law," and such like terms and expressions have been reiterated, in such a way as to imply that it had been violated or contemptuously disregarded. Now, the *direct contrary* more nearly expresses the *reality*. What the Church justly complained of, aye, and unanswerably demonstrated too, was, that the civil courts which ought to have been the guardians of constitutional law, were *themselves* the *Law-breakers*. They were the civil courts that crossed the border—broke down the boundary line—virtually displaced the sovereignty of the Redeemer in his own proper kingdom—usurped his throne and seat of judgment—violently interfered with the administration of his law—and waged impious war against the rights and liberties of his subjects and people. So that the cry ought exactly to be reversed, "the

law, the law of the Church, the majesty and supremacy of the law of Christ, its Great Head and King." "Let us vindicate that law from the insults and tyrannous encroachments of Cæsars ministers!"

On this subject of "law," it is refreshing to meet with the manly, straightforward, and disinterested statement of a competent Judge. In a late number of the *Westminster Review*, an able writer remarks, as follows:—

"Observation" says he "of the course of the law in the progress of this controversy is not much calculated to increase our reverence either for the law itself, or the functionaries who administer it. Most unquestionably, close inspection of the decisions and speeches of the judges reveals abundance of blunders. The most eminent Non-Intrusionists justly complain that the civil courts have confounded the difference between constitutional and what may be termed administrative law. The one, say they, assigns the functions and limits of the respective courts: the other lays down the rules or methods by which they are to determine on the proper subjects which have been respectively allocated to them. Now our Court of Session, and of course the House of Lords, when acting as its appellant court, were limited to things civil—our Church Courts were recognized as distinct and unfettered in things ecclesiastical. If any question included both, their conflicting decisions were followed by civil and ecclesiastical effects, which were incongruous, no doubt, but did not come into collision, as when the rejected presentee, or his patron, got the stipend, and the Church Courts filled up the vacancy by a stipendless minister of their own. Now how, say they, does the matter stand? Our constitutional rights were secured at the Revolution settlement. Twenty years after this an act passed on the subject of patronage. A hundred and thirty years farther on, the discovery is made of what no one suspected before (neither lawyers nor ecclesiastics,) that in this act there lay what was only brought out for the first time by the House of Lords—a direct infringement of our prior constitution. Was it not then the duty of the legislature to remedy their own blunder—their own law? And is not their refusal to do so a direct breach of national faith? Such are the just complaints of the Non-Intrusionists when required, in spiritual affairs, to disobey the Lord Jesus Christ in obedience to the Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst. No wonder, then, the interdicts of the civil courts were torn in pieces, and the fragments trampled under foot, amidst the applause of large assemblies. No wonder, though the Whig Lord-Advocate Rutherford, and the Tory Lord-Advocate Rae, thought it prudent to inflict no punishment on those who treated interdicts of the civil courts, respecting preaching and sacraments, with the most contumelious scorn.

"As a specimen of the blunders of the law lords, we may mention the decision in the Auchterarder case. They found the Presbytery astricted, and bound to take the presentee on trial, which was precisely what had been already done. The first part of the trials by the constitution of the Church of Scotland is preaching "trial sermons" before the people. The presentee was rejected because he had failed in his trials. Yet the absolute wisdom of the law lords found the Presbytery bound to do what they had done. Mark another odious feature of this decision—the case with which men appointed to administer the laws, usurp the function of making laws. Because the act of Queen Anne said the Presbytery were bound and astricted to receive and admit the presentee, after taking him on trials, three or four Lords, on their mere wills, took it upon themselves to say, for the first time, what had never been said during the hundred and thirty years since the passing of the act, substantially, that the Church Courts were bound to ordain the presentee. This was judge-made law with vengeance. Had the most powerful minister this country has ever seen, a man who held between his finger and his thumb the fortunes of a



hundred law Lords brought in with due form a bill to compel clergymen to confer spiritual offices at the bidding of civil judges, he would have failed in the attempt amidst the derision of all sincere men in Europe. But three or four law Lords effect the purpose themselves of a morning—without warning, without opposition, without rendering a reason, by a little skill in the management of legal quiddities—men on whose minds the study of the law has exercised all the narrowing and debasing influences by which it converts immortal spirits into quibbling machines—establish a principle new to the law, and monstrous in the view of common sense, and by doing so inflict, blindly, the heaviest blow given in this day to all the institutions of the country, disrupt the most useful and honored of Established Churches, and throw upon revolutionary courses and connections a million of Scotchmen, whose religious position previously made them the natural guardians of order and the constitution. In proportion to the worthlessness of the thing for which they claim obedience is the loudness of their cry—"obey the law." In the House of Lords, on this question, claptrap sure of cheers was any allusion to obedience to the law.

"Mark what the thing is for which claims to obedience are set up. After their decisions have compelled five hundred clergymen to leave the Establishment, and when according to Lord Aberdeen, one hundred and fifty more have almost resolved to follow, a bill is passed in the House of Lords to declare what the law of the matter is. Most of the Scotch judges authorise Lord Aberdeen to say, they deem his bill a very exact statement of what the law is at present. On this up start three of the four English judges whose decree expelled the Free Kirkmen and say. "*If this bill is exact, if the Scotch judges are right on the Scotch law, we were quite wrong in our recent decision.*" It is not surprising that the law Lords felt the sting of the disgrace with which this act covers them. Rumour says, that so conscious were the cabinet of the shame with which Lord Aberdeen's Scotch Kirk Bill clothes the law Lords, that he induced them to support it only by a threat of resignation, and consenting to call his bill at the same time declaratory and enacting, that is, a statement that the law precisely is that, certain, which it precisely is not."

5th. Again, the cry of "novelty," unheard of "novelty," has been raised in reference to the *principle* and the *practice* of Non-Intrusion; as if both the *principle* and the *practice* were really *novel* and *recent*—deriving their origin and pedigree from the Veto Act of 1834! And this has been gravely asserted and published by some leading ministers on the Moderate side of the Church! Let us hear the Rev. Andrew Gray of Perth in reply. "They hold it," says he, "to be a *new thing* for the Church to make the consent of the people indispensable to the formation of the Pastoral tie. It is "contrary to all former practice" not to require the people, when they withhold their consent, or interpose their dissent, to state their reasons, for the consideration of the Church Courts. And so, in the particular case of Marnoch it is "contrary to all former practice" not to hand over the people of that parish to the tender mercies of the Presbytery of Strathbogie, that the grounds of their dissent may be judged of by that "moderate" body, and that it may be determined whether or not any effect shall be given to them. Such is the view of Messrs. —. It is contrary to all former practice for the Church to regard the want of the people's consent, or the people's actual dissent, as any bar to a settlement, unless the reasons by which the people are influenced be stated to the Presbytery, and find acceptance in their eyes. Now, my answer is, that what these gentlemen allege to be "contrary to all former practice," is in exact accordance with the best, and most approved, and most authoritative practice, to which history enables us to refer. What say my reverend friends to the First Book

of Discipline, and the Act of Assembly, 1562, by which the choice of a pastor was vested in the congregation? Will they assert that the congregation were required to condescend upon the reasons of their choice, and that, unless these were sustained, the choice was set aside? The Reformers did not continue to insist for popular election, but they held fast by the necessity of popular consent. The Assembly enacted, in 1576, "That Ministers should be appointed with the consent of the Ministers of the province, and consent of the flock to whom they shall be appointed." The Second Book of Discipline was sanctioned in 1578, registered in the books of Assembly in 1581, and has always been received as of the highest authority. What, then, does it say? "Election is the choosing out of a person or persons most able to the office that yakes, by the judgment of the eldership and consent of the congregation." "So that none be intruded upon any congregation, either by the prince or any inferior person, without lawful election, and the assent of the people over whom the person is placed, as the practice of the Apostolical and Primitive Kirk, and good order craves." "It is to be avoided that no person be intruded into any of the offices of the Kirk contrary to the will of the congregation to whom they appointed, or without the voice of the Eldership."

Thus it was the mind of the Reformed Church of Scotland, that no induction to the pastoral office could take place without the people's consent. The non-concurrence of the congregation, it was held, was an insuperable bar to a Minister's settlement. It will, moreover, be readily seen that there were only two ways in which that non-concurrence could be ascertained; either the silence of the people, when invited to concur, must have been regarded as intimating their refusal so to do; or their non-concurrence must have been announced in an express declaration. The want of the consent of the people could only be discovered by the silence of the people, when their consent was asked; or by the utterance of the voice of the people, in the shape of a formal dissent. In the veto law, the Church has adapted the latter mode of ascertaining the presence of that popular consent which she deems essential to the formation of the pastoral tie. If there be no dissent from the people, she holds that she has the consent of the people to the settlement of the presentee. But the Church does not care for the Veto Law, in particular. What she cares for is the great principle that no Minister be settled in any parish, unless the congregation are willing to have him. Let that be otherwise effectually secured, and she is ready to repeal the Veto Law to-morrow.

The principle of the Veto is, that there must be a willing people, as well as a willing presentee—that it is necessary to ascertain their consent to have him for their pastor, as well as his consent to have them for his flock. And this is not a novelty. It is as old as the year 1736, when it was declared by the Assembly to be a "principle of this Church that no Minister shall be intruded into any parish contrary to the will of the congregation"—it is as old as the year 1638, when an act of Assembly was passed, to assert and secure the same great principle—it is as old as the Second Book of Discipline, which pronounces the consent of the people an essential condition of a Minister's settlement—it is as old as the Reformation itself, the authors of which laid it down that "every several Church ought to have their votes and suffrages in the election of their Minister"—it is as old, in fine, as "the Apostolical and Primitive Kirk," the scriptural order of which required that none be intruded upon any congregation—without consent of the people.\*

---

\* That the principle of Non-Intrusion was ever a fundamental one in the constitution

6th. The Church also has been charged with "dishonesty," "insincerity," and "inconsistency," in appealing her case to the House of Lords at all, and then, in not abiding by their Lordships' decision, in its *entireness* and *absoluteness*. The appeal has been adduced as proving that the Church virtually admitted the *civil supremacy*—virtually renounced her claims to a separate and independent jurisdiction. But "the appeal," replies Mr. Gray of Perth, "ought not to be thus construed. Its real import was the opposite of what is alleged. Instead of its being a compromise and abandonment of the principles she maintains with respect to the powers she has derived from her Divine and only Head, it is to be viewed as demonstrating that her adherence to them remains unshaken. It is because she was convinced that her jurisdiction was not dependent upon the Court of Session, and that that judicatory had no title to control her proceedings, that she took her appeal to the House of Lords. The Court of Session had entered her *revinice*; her object was to compel that Court to retire within the limits of its own jurisdiction. But how was her object to be accomplished? She herself makes no pretensions to that supereminent control which she denies to the Court of Session; she fully acknowledges that she has no power to coerce a co-ordinate tribunal. Her course, therefore, was to apply to those who have power over the Court of Session, and who can put an end to what she deems an unconstitutional interference. It is said that, by her appeal, she admitted the supremacy of the House of Lords. She did—she did admit the House of Lords to be supreme with relation to the Court of Session; and, therefore, she went to the House of Lords to crave that it would be pleased to set the Court of Session right. She went to the House of Lords, not because she was perplexed with doubts which she longed to

of the Church of Scotland, is incontrovertibly clear from the concurrent testimony, alike of her standards and history. That, in practice, the operation of it was often suspended, in times of violence and anarchy, is at once admitted. But even then it stood unexpurgated in the standards and scriptural constitution of the Church. That the principle was substantially carried out into practical effect, whenever the Church was relieved from external pressure, must also be evident to every reader of history.

In connection with this view of the subject, the following case is narrated as an example, by which the doctrine of non-intrusion will be illustrated and confirmed:—

"In the General Assembly, 1602, a complaint was brought forward by the Synod of Glasgow against Mr. George Symple, bearing that they had repeatedly prohibited him from "meddling with the ministry of the Kirk of Killelanc, for the causes and considerations known to them, and specially for a great mislyking that specials of the Paroch had of him;" and yet the said Mr. George Symple "insistit in suiting of the said Kirk," &c. On this complaint the deliverance of the Assembly was as follows:—"The Assembly, after due trial, absolves the said Mr. George from all evil crimes and eye-lists which were laid to his charge either by the brethren of the said province, or by the parishioners of Killelanc; and gives him, by those presents, one testimony of his honest behaviour; but in respect that he was never fully plantit minister at the said Kirk, and of the great mislyking that is betwixt him and sundry of the said parishioners of Killelanc, as said is, think it not good that he be plantit minister at the said Kirk, and therefore ordain him to desist therefrae, and demitt the presentation made to him of the benefice thereof," &c.—(Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 529, 530.)

Here we have,

1st. A finding that the presentee is innocent of all scandalous offences which might subject him to deprivation.

2nd. A finding the special objections by the parishioners are without foundation.

3rd. A testimonial of character granted to the presentee.

4th. A sentence, determining that the settlement ought not to take place, and requiring the surrender of the presentation, on the sole ground of "the great mislyking that is betwixt him and sundry of the parishioners."

This case, which occurred in an Assembly that met in the palace of Holyrood, and had the honour of the Monarch's personal presence, will serve to show what were the original principles of the Church on the subject of Non-Intrusion, and what was the admitted import of the statements relating to it in the Second Book of Discipline."

have set at rest; but because she had no doubts whatever, and was fully persuaded that her rightful jurisdiction had been infringed. She might, indeed have refrained from appealing, and rushed with fiery zeal into that collision to which she believed the proceedings of the Court of Session inevitably tended; but surely she acted a more becoming part, when, deprecating the conflict which must arise, should the Court of Session persevere in the course on which it had entered, she repaired to that exalted tribunal, by which all that is transacted in the Court of Session may be reviewed, and besought it to prevent the impending strife, by reversing the judgment which was adverse to her liberties.

But did she not appeal upon the merits as well as on the point of jurisdiction? She did undoubtedly appeal upon the merits; but why did she do so? Did she seek to justify her procedure, because she held that it was competent for the Civil Courts to overturn what she had done, or to inflict pains and penalties upon her Presbyteries, if dissatisfied with the manner in which they executed the duties committed to them? No. The true and sole reason, was her laudable desire that the civil sanction and civil benefits might not be disjoined from those of her actings, which were called in question? Not only did she not deny—she was forward to concede—that the Civil Courts had the exclusive right to administer the law of the land, in regard to the disposal of the temporalities of her parishes. To that extent, she admitted their jurisdiction. And for the purpose of enabling them to adjudicate fairly as to the temporalities—and to show that they ought not to confiscate her endowments—she willingly addressed herself to the vindication of her conduct before them.

Aware that advantage might be taken of the appeal to put a construction upon that step which it did not necessarily bear and which she never intended it to bear, she adopted the precaution of contemporaneously announcing what her principles were with respect to the points it involved. The same General Assembly which directed the Court of Session's judgment to be appealed against, passed the resolution, wherein the exclusive jurisdiction of the Civil Courts in regard to the civil rights and emoluments of the Church is unqualifiedly acknowledged, and wherein also the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church, founded on the Word of God, in all matters touching her own doctrine, government, and discipline, is asserted, and the intention expressed of "at all hazards" defending it. Now it has been the delight of some to argue that the Church stultified herself when she passed the resolution, and also ordered the appeal. But before it can be shown that such is the case, it must be shown that the resolution and the appeal are irreconcilable. It is not enough to show that a construction might be put upon the appeal which would be at variance with the principles avowed in the resolution. One of the circumstances which rendered the resolution necessary, was just the admitted possibility of the import and design of the appeal being misunderstood. By the resolution its character was fixed and its real meaning promulgated to the world. Thereby most distinct intimation was given that, so far as the merits of the cause which was the subject of appeal were concerned, the Church would go into them only that the civil question as to the benefice might be determined in her favour; and that with reference to her spiritual jurisdiction, she did not recognise in any Civil Court the right to interfere with it, but simply went upon the competency of the House of Lords to protect it from invasion by the Court of Session." Accordingly, it may be added, as explained in the fourth Lecture of the series, that to the decision of the Supreme Civil Court, in reference to the disposal of the *temporalities*, the Church implicitly, and unconditionally submitted, as she always had done, and would always be ready to do;—reserving to herself the sole disposal of the *spiritualities*.

7th. The stigmatizing cry of "priestly ambition" and "Popish tyranny" has also rung in the ears of the nation, till it has confounded the simple, and befuddled many even of the wise. If this cry had been raised on the principle of *contraries*, it would be intelligible; otherwise, it is not. For, what is the simple, naked fact of the case? The Evangelical Clergy did not wish for one jot or tittle of additional power to themselves. On the contrary, when a noble Lord proposed to introduce a Bill into Parliament which would have the effect of conferring such power, they unanimously opposed it; and the Lord High Chancellor of the day commended them for their disinterestedness and integrity in so doing. What, then, did they contend for?—For the *restoration* to the *ordinary members* of Christ's Church of a power of which they had long been unjustly deprived. And this must be denounced under the egregious misnomers of priestly ambition and Popish tyranny! What! The generous and heroic resolve to restore to the multitude of God's own people those rights and prerogatives of which, through the grinding force of lordly oppression, they had for ages been denied; a priestly ambition and Popish tyranny! Then, assuredly, must the much belauded effort of William IV. the "Patriot King," to extend the civil franchise to the myriads of his people, be henceforth reprobated as kingly ambition and autocratic tyranny!

Even the Westminster Review, Radical though it be, has risen up to defend the Evangelical or Non-Intrusion Clergy of the Church of Scotland from so foul and slanderous a calumny. In a powerful article, which appeared in a recent number, the writer thus comments on the *inconsistency* of the "Liberals" in dealing with the Scotch Church question. "The hatred," says he, "of Clerical power—the outcry against priestcraft, which these Journalists assume to be praiseworthy feeling, was itself, in this case, an illiberal, anti-popular, anti-democratic thing. When a people have a voice in the election of ministers, whether in the shape of a no, or an aye, the Clergy can exercise over them only the legitimate influences of wisdom, knowledge, and character. In the present case, the Clergy reserved no power to themselves, except the legitimate influence of superior wisdom. They sought to make the people their Patrons. Their object was to make the people their masters in the matter of *appointment to benefices*. When the Liberal Journals opposed and vilified them, they so far betrayed the cause of popular rights—and outraged the great democratic idea of fair play to talent—of the Right and the Fit. In this case, in so far as Liberalism would make the poor stronger, these writers were false to it—in so far as Liberalism would establish the authority of justice and wisdom, they thwarted it."

Making due allowance for the somewhat peculiar *Westminsterianism*, and not altogether accurate phrasology, in which the leading idea in this passage is couched, it is extremely valuable, inasmuch as it is the recorded impartial opinion of an influential Journalist as to the utter groundlessness of the preposterous charges of "priestly ambition and Popish tyranny."

8th. An odious clamour about "schism and schismatics" has also been made to ring in men's ears—in order to scare and perplex, to frighten and repel. Never, however, was clamour more utterly unfounded. On this point, it is remarked in the Pastoral Address of the first General Assembly of the *Free Church*, as follows:—"Schism is a sinful because an unnecessary separation from the Church. But there is not here, properly speaking, a separation from the Church at all. Whatever, in the eye of law, may henceforth constitute the Church of Scotland, assuredly that Church, in the eye of conscience, and of the Lord of conscience,—that Church, while yet acting freely and without coercion of the civil power, pledged itself before God and the world, in its "Claim of Right," to renounce the Establish-

ment rather than submit to those conditions which have since been imposed. It has now only redeemed its pledge. It is the Church, properly speaking, which has separated from the State. Assuredly this is not schism. And those are the true and only schismatics who, by refusing to take the same step when duty required it, have thus, and thus only, caused the disruption of the Church."

Moreover, the very argument which the Reformers so triumphantly employed to justify their separation from the Church of Rome, and vindicate it from the obnoxious charge of "schism" may be successfully applied to vindicate the members of the Free Church of Scotland. The Church of Rome, they proved, by its adoption of false doctrines, did really become *schismatical*, that is, did *separate itself* from the communion of the *true Catholic Church*, which is distinguished by its *cleaving to the Head alone*, by the purity of its faith and right administration of ordinances. To separate then, from it, so far from amounting to schism, was the only way of *avoiding the guilt of schism*, by returning into the communion of the *true Catholic Church*. So, in the present case. Having proved that the Established Church of Scotland has practically surrendered the vital doctrine of the Supreme Headship of Christ, with the divinely conferred rights and privileges which flow therefrom, and which hitherto have been held sacred and essential because truly scriptural, it has thereby been proved to have become *schismatical*, that is, to have *separated itself from the ancient veritable Church of Scotland*. To separate, therefore, from such an altered and transformed Establishment, so far from being schismatical, is the only way of escaping the great sin of schism, by resolving to *retain, unaltered and unmodified*, all the great scriptural principles which for three centuries have characterized the *real National Church of Scotland*, now wholly identified with the **FREE CHURCH**.

9th. Lastly, and to conclude, no cry has been raised more vehemently or injuriously than the senseless and the groundless one of "Rebellion"—"rebellion against the State." A moment's consideration will serve to dispel the illusion. "What," asks the author of a vigorous anonymous pamphlet, "What is rebellion? Is it not disobedience to the lawful command of a lawful authority?\*" And that surely can be no lawful command, which requires the Church to trample on the spiritual rights and interests of Christ's people, and to surrender the privilege which God has given her. And that surely can be no lawful authority, to constitute which, one court of this land, by law established, must pass over from its assigned department, into the assigned department of another court of this land, equally by law established, and, seated on a tribunal which it has no right to occupy, give judgment on matters with which it has no right to intermeddle.† Before this charge of rebellion, then, can be made good, it must be proved not only that the command itself is lawful, compliance with which would not be an act of sin, but it must also be established that a Civil Court is the legal constitutional authority of these lands in all matters concerning the internal Government of the Church of Scotland,—empowered to review, control, chastise her courts in all their ecclesiastical actings. But so long as there

\* The definition here given of rebellion, is plainly involved in § 4, ch. 20 of the Confession of Faith. There, resisting the ordinance of God, which alone constitutes the crime of rebellion, is described to be "opposing any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical."

† The Court of Session was instituted by Act of Parliament, in the 16th century, for the express purpose of doing justice "in actions civil," and the Church Courts were recognised and ratified by Act of Parliament, during the same century, for the purpose of "pausing order to all matters and causes ecclesiastical."

stand unrepealed on the Statute-Book of this realm, parliamentary enactments recognising and ratifying her entire and independent jurisdiction in all matters ecclesiastical,—so long as the law of this land confirms, as it most unequivocally does, the independent power of the Church in all spiritual concerns, and especially in the matter of the settlement of ministers;—then, certainly, not the Church Court disobeys that law, in maintaining her independence so recognised and ratified, but the Civil Court, in attempting to invade it. It is never for a moment denied that the *temporalities*, the State endowments, the parochial provision for an Established Church, or, in other words, the income of every parish minister in Scotland, is in the hands and under the control of civil authority. Our Church Courts are not so restless in their own territory as to pass into that of the Court of Session, and give judgment on secular affairs, however much the principle of retaliation might justify them. They have made no such *lawless attempt*."

To this we may simply add, that if a manly constitutional resistance to Civil Courts, that were trampling under foot the faith of national treaties, and marching dry shod over the entire stream of defensive statutory enactments;—if devoted loyalty to the King of kings in nobly asserting his sole Headship and sovereign supremacy in his own Church and Kingdom;—if all this be rebellion against the State, then have the Evangelical Clergy of Scotland been "rebels"! But in that case, how much more must constitutional resistance to Civil Courts that would strive to rob us of the rights and privileges of *Magna Charta*, and a stout and sturdy declaration of the Emperor of China's paramount jurisdiction in his own dominions, be denounced as an abrogation of the *civil* supremacy of Queen Victoria in the British isles, and consequently, as rebellion against the British Crown!

Such are some of the *words and expressions*, or "idols of the Market," which in the recent grand controversy in Scotland, exercised a blinding idolatrising influence over the minds of misguided myriads. The Church the Creature of the State—presumption and arrogance in the interpretation of statutes—the compact between Church and State—the Law of the land—dishonesty and insincerity—novelty of the non-intrusion principle—priestly ambition and Popish tyranny—schism and rebellion!—marvellous misnomers! Phantastical misapplications! Incredible confusion of ideas! Misshapen spectres from the land of shades! Mighty, doubtless, has been the temporary advantage gained by the plentiful and persevering use of such offensive and terrific names; but, mighty also will be the retribution! When the heats and asperities of controversy are quietly entombed in oblivion, posterity will begin, leisurely and dispassionately, to inquire into the proper import and significance of these terms. And when it discovers that, as presently employed, they have *no real* meaning, because *no just* or *valid* application—that they are not the verbal symbols of actual realities at all, but only the names of excited fancies, delusive shadows, or phantastical conceits, that have nothing in the facts of the case corresponding to them—what must be their grief, their amazement, their indignation? In swiftly banishing them clean out of memory, they will chase them into the "Limbo of vanity," along with the "sensible species," the "primum mobiles," the "crystalline spheres," the "quiddities and universals," and all the other spectral phantasms that have been already consigned to the grave of ancient error! Then, then will it be found that however great the triumph now, it has been but airy and ephemeral after all—that, however slow the retribution, it will be eternal when it comes!

IV.—The fourth class of Idols or errors consists of gratuitously assumed

dogmas, prevalent but unfounded theories, and unsound modes or rules of demonstration. These have been called "*Idols of the Theatre*," because all the resulting systems of science and philosophy are but as "so many stage-plays, written or acted; so that by them so many fictitious and scenic worlds have been called into being."

What influence have not these exerted? And what retardation of true knowledge?—When *fire* or *water* or *air*, or any other single element was made the origin of all things, what violence was done to the whole range of Natural Phenomena, to cause them to bend into the theory? When the doctrine of the *four elements*, and then of the *three principles*, salt, sulphur, and mercury, reigned in chemical science, what a distortion of facts resulted? Then came the famous phlogistic theory, or that which attributed the reduction of metals into earths, and the restoration of earths into metals, &c., to the addition or subtraction of a peculiar combustible element, designated *phlogiston*. With what resolute obstinacy was it clung to in the face of the most contradictory facts! How reluctantly, were the most stubborn phenomena made to yield to it! How slowly, even after the most successful and conclusive experiments, did the distinguished advocates of the old system abandon it! It was only after ten years of desperate resistance that Berthollet declared, "I lay down my arms and abandon the cause of phlogiston." Priestly, remarks Cuvier, "saw without flinching, the most skilful defenders of the ancient theory go over to the enemy in succession; and when Kirwan, almost the last of all, abjured phlogiston, Priestly remained alone on the field of battle and threw out a new challenge, in a memoir addressed to the principal French chemists." When the ancient Astronomical dogmas that "the earth is the centre of the universe and at rest"—and that "the celestial orbs must all move in perfect circles and with an uniform motion"—were received without question and without challenge, as belonging to that fundamental class of truths that ought not to admit of the possibility of doubt—with what cumbrous complexities were the heavens peopled? Cycles were superadded to cycles, and epicycles to epicycles,—every newly discovered motion or irregularity leading to the introduction of a new circle and a new wheel into the increasingly involved mechanism! Till at length the system augmented into such wild and extravagant intricacy,—with many scores of spheres or globes of crystal that "revolved among and through each other without fracture or jar"—that King Alphonso was tempted, with a prophane sneer, to exclaim that "had God Almighty left the making of the heavens to him, he would have enstamped it with vastly more of harmony and order!"—Still, every new phenomenon, instead of awakening suspicion, led only to the desire to adjust it to the theory, not alter the theory to suit it—the truth of the dogmas or tenets on which the system rested, and which truly "necessitated its fallacies and its cumbrousness," being never questioned. How thoroughly a false but consecrated theory, like the Ptolemaic, obstructed the progress of true science, the persecutions of Galileo have immortalized. How, despite the reasonings of Copernicus, was the genius even of Tycho Brahe fettered by it! How did a bigotted adhesion to the imaginary Astronomical theory of Des Cartes resist and impede the true or Newtonian theory! How did the fictitious theory "that Nature abhors a vacuum," repress curiosity, silence inquiry, throw the mind into dormancy, and variously obstruct the progress of different branches of natural science! How did the Ideal theory misdirect, mould, and modify all investigations into the true philosophy of the human mind! How did the *exclusive* votaries of the Wernesian or Huttonian theories, wrest, twist, bend, and pervert the most stubborn facts, and throw over them the glare of a false colouring! What endless and nameless theories in every Physical Science—each for a time ruling and squaring all phenomena—



brooking no rival, and ending in being devoured by a more successful competitor!

But it is needless to adduce more examples of the obstructive and mischievous effects of baseless dogmas, theories, or rules of judging. The history of science, philosophy and religion, teems with the painful records of them. It is enough for our present purpose to note, that if all subjects have been encumbered with erroneous dogmas and theories, it was not to be expected that one of such transcendent importance as that of the connexion between Church and State, with all the relative and collateral questions involved therein, could escape unaffected or untouched. And so the result has proved. A few of the hasty, partial, conjectural, or wholly fictitious dogmas and theories, that have sprung from so fertile a source of controversy, we now proceed to notice.

1st. *The Erastian Theory.*—The Church, it has been said, is an organized body like any other civil corporation—resembling a Town Council or Company or Association incorporated by Royal Charter—and deriving not only its rights and privileges, but its constitution and very being from the State. This is the Erastian Theory, which virtually if not actually denies the existence of an independent spiritual kingdom, with its spiritual Head, and spiritual government, and spiritual laws, and spiritual privileges,—altogether making the State the fountain of all ecclesiastical as of all Civil Power, prerogative, and law. It is a theory which, in different degrees, and with modifications more or less important, is held by numbers in every rank and condition.—Laymen and Ecclesiastics—Philosophers, Peers and Peasants! How can it be wondered at that individuals, holding such an unscriptural, secularizing, and preposterous theory, in any of its forms, could regard with favour the advocates of *Spiritual* freedom or independence? Can we wonder that they should denounce those who advocate such freedom and independence as restless agitators, disturbers of the public peace, and the projectors of wild, visionary, chimerical schemes?—To expect it otherwise, would be to expect something vastly more improbable than that the Ptolemaic theorists in Astronomy would gladly and cheerfully surrender the brilliant, but doating fancies of ages, to the plain common sense of Copernicus, or the mathematical demonstrations of Newton! It is not in human nature thus easily to retire, and resign the pleasures of a favourite and long cherished theory! As to the *merits* of the theory itself, enough has already been advanced under former heads to expose its utter groundlessness and Anti-Christianism. The faith all true believers, and even the common sense of right-thinking men must ever be revolted at a theory, whose principle implies “that the relations of the Christian clergy to the State, or Civil Power, imports no greater independence of control than those of soldiers or sailors to their commanding officers”—or “the absolute subserviency of spiritual persons in spiritual affairs to *merely civil* powers and *civil* penalties!”

2nd. *The Legal Theory.*—This is the theory of those who—while they shrink from affiliating the monstrous dogma, that the State is the *creative source* of the Church, and the Church, consequently, the *mere creature of the State*—yet do not scruple to affirm that the Church, in entering into alliance with the State, was placed by the latter, or did voluntarily place herself, *under* the paramount jurisdiction of the Civil Tribunals of the Land;—or, in other words, that the Statutes which *established* the Church, as interpreted by the Civil Courts, must also regulate *the whole* of her *internal* administration.

Those, of course, who have been led to adopt this most unfounded theory could see in the conduct of the Evangelical majority, in refusing to submit the Church's internal and spiritual administration to the magisterial regula-

tion of the Civil Courts, nothing but strongheaded contumacy, and a something like insurrectionary lawlessness. The utter untenableness of the theory itself, on which such grave charges have been so gratuitously founded, has been thus lucidly and conclusively exposed by Mr. Gray:—

“The Court of Session” says he, “has substantially said to the Courts of the Church, ‘It is your duty to proceed to the trials and ordination of presentees, though there be no call from the people, and against their unanimous dissent.’ The Courts of the Church have substantially replied, ‘We take a different view of our duty in that matter: we hold that neither the law of God, nor the law of man—neither Scripture rules, nor the statutes of this realm—require us to disregard the want of the popular concurrence in the settlement of Ministers. We hold, on the contrary, that it were both a sin and an illegal deed, a breach of God’s law and man’s law, to intrude a minister into a parish, contrary to the will of the Congregation.’

What! it is said, will you, a Church established by the State, set up your opinion of the law of the land against what the State itself declares to be the law of the land? Now herein lies one of the great fallacies resorted to by the opponents of the Church in this controversy. They take it for granted that the Court of Session is the State; or, at least the only constitutional organ through which the mind of the State can be expressed. And so they hold disobedience to the Court of Session to be always and necessarily the same thing as disobedience to the State. But this view of the rights and constitutional character of the Court of Session is completely erroneous. The Court of Session is neither the State, nor is it the only authorized organ through which the will of the State is to be ascertained. It is true, the Court of Session is a Court of the State; but so is the General Assembly. While the former is a Court of the State by *creation*, the latter is a Court of the State by *adoption*.

According to the constitution of this part of the empire, as finally settled and ratified at the Union, there are four distinct classes of Courts, amongst which the administration of public affairs is parcelled out and distributed. First, we have the Civil Courts, comprehending the House of Lords, Court of Session, and Sheriff Courts. Secondly, we have the Criminal Courts, comprehending the High Court of Justiciary, and the Circuit and Sheriff Criminal Courts, but not including the House of Lords. Thirdly, we have the Revenue Court, or Court of Exchequer. And fourthly, we have the Ecclesiastical, or Church Courts, consisting of the General Assembly, Synods, Presbyteries, and Church Session. Amongst these four classes of Courts, as has been said, the public affairs of the country are parcelled out. The Civil Courts are the Courts of the State for civil matters—that is to say, for all questions relating to property, and ordinary personal rights; the Criminal Courts, are the Courts of the State for criminal matters; the Revenue Court is the Court of the State for matters connected with the revenue, as the trial and punishment of smugglers, and the like; the Ecclesiastical Courts—those Courts which derive their authority from Christ alone—are, by adoption, the Courts of the State for all matters and causes ecclesiastical. Thus, then, if the title to an estate, or the validity of a will is to be determined, or the obligation of a debt ascertained, we go to the Civil Courts; if a culprit is to be tried, we look to the Criminal Courts; if a fraud upon the revenue is to be punished, we look to the Court of Exchequer; and if a point of discipline is to be disposed of, or a Minister is to be settled, we turn to the Courts Ecclesiastical.

The House of Lords is not the common Court of Appeal set over the four classes of Courts, but, as has been intimated, is simply the head of that class to which the charge of civil matters is committed. In its judicial capacity, the House of Lords is merely one of the Civil Courts. It has

authority over the Court of Session, but it has none over the Court of Justiciary, or the Court of Exchequer, or the General Assembly. Every body knows this.

The four classes of Courts are, in their separate departments, and in the discharge of their several duties, independent of each other. They are, all of them, Courts of the State, although they have not all become such in the same way; and the State has not entrusted any of them with the office of looking after the rest, and putting them right when they go wrong. Our constitutional arrangement, guaranteed at the Union, presents us with no over-riding Court or set of Courts, whose duty it is to direct the Courts of another department how to exercise their functions, and what they ought to do. The Court of Justiciary, for example, has no title to dictate to the Court of Session. The latter may go wrong, may act in violation of its duty; but the Criminal Court has nothing to do with that: it is bound to confine itself to its own affairs. In like manner the Court of Session has not the least authority over the Justiciary Court. No doubt the latter sometimes errs; but the former is not empowered to interfere when it does. To put an extreme case: suppose the Criminal Court were to refuse to try a felon except on some condition never heard of before, and totally unknown to the law, could the Civil Court compel it to do its duty? No man who knows any thing about the matter will say that it could. The Criminal Court is not answerable to the Civil, any more than the Civil Court is answerable to the Criminal. Both are answerable to the State, that is to say, to Parliament; Parliament can interfere with both, should it perceive any abuse of their powers: but neither is answerable to the other. In like manner the Court of Session has no right to meddle with the Ecclesiastical Courts.\* The Civil Court and the Church Court has each its separate walk, in which the State expects to see it moving—each its separate department, over which the State expects to see it presiding. The Court of Session was instituted by act of Parliament in the sixteenth century for the express purpose of “doing justice in actions civil;” and the Church Courts were recognised and ratified by act of Parliament during the same century, for the purpose of “putting order to all matters and causes ecclesiastical.” Thus the provinces assigned are completely distinct; and not a word occurs in any statute whatever to countenance the idea that the Court of Session is warranted to leave its own civil matters, and to go and tell the Church Courts how they are to manage their ecclesiastical matters. In fact, for any thing that the laws say, the General Assembly has as good a right to take the Court of Session to task in civil matters, as the latter has to dictate to the Assembly, or any other Church Court in the matter of admitting a minister to a parish. As was said before, the Church Courts are as much the Courts of the State for ecclesiastical matters as the Court of Session, with its superior, the House of Lords, and its subordinates, the Sheriff Courts, are the Courts of the State for civil matters. The Church Courts are answerable to the State, even as the Court of Session is answerable to the State. Parliament may come down upon both, if it sees occasion to do so: it may abolish the Court of Session, and it may cast off and disown the Church Courts, and reduce them to the situation of the Courts of

\* The jurisdiction of the Court of Session over Presbyteries with respect to manors, glebes and schools, forms no exception to the above observation. When dealing with these matters, the Presbytery is a civil and not an ecclesiastical court. We have an exact analogy to this in the Sheriff Courts, which are subject to the Court of Session in civil matters; but in criminal matters are subject to the Court of Justiciary, just as the Presbytery in matters ecclesiastical is subject to the General Assembly.

a dissenting community. But the Courts ecclesiastical and civil are not answerable the one to the other.

There are two things connected with the religious establishment in every parish. The stipend, manse, and glebe form together what is called the Benefice, and that is one of the two things. The other is the office of the Holy Ministry. These two things, the Benefice and the office, are not only distinct,—they are diverse from each other. Their very natures are different. The former is of the earth; the latter is from heaven. The Benefice is temporal or civil, the office is spiritual or ecclesiastical. Hence it comes to pass that, agreeably to the economy of our jurisprudence which has been explained, the Benefice, which is the civil thing, belongs to the jurisdiction of the Civil Court, and falls to be disposed of by its decisions and decrees; and the office, which is the ecclesiastical thing, belongs to the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Court, and is regulated and disposed of by its determinations. Every question about the stipend is a question for the Court of Session, and every question about the function of the Ministry is a question for the judicatories of the Church. The Court, which the State recognises as entitled to adjudicate in regard to the temporalities, is the Court of Session—the Court which deals in civil things; and the Courts, which the State recognises as entitled to adjudicate in regard to the Pastoral office, are the Church Courts—the Courts which deal in ecclesiastical things. The judgments of the Church Courts therefore, with respect to the office, are as much the law of the land, as are the judgments of the Court of Session with respect to the Benefice. If the Church Courts were to begin to pass decrees for disposing of the stipend, manse, and glebe, finding and declaring by what party they ought, and by what party ought not to be enjoyed, these would not be law, and no body would be bound to pay any attention to them; and, in like manner, were the Court of Session to pass decrees for disposing of the Pastoral functions, and fixing the circumstances in which, or the persons, on whom, they are to be bestowed, such decrees would not be law, and the Church Courts would be entitled, nay, would be bound in duty, to disregard them. Did I say, were the Court of Session to pass such decrees? This the Court of Session has actually begun to do. For the first time since it was a Court it has begun to take the direction of the Church Courts in the performance of their own ecclesiastical duty, and to prescribe to them on what principles they must convey the sacred office of the Ministry. Of old, when it was asked to look after, and control the Church Courts in the filling up of vacancies and the induction of Ministers, it steadily refused to “meddle,” because that would either be “interfering with the power of ordination, or with the internal policy of the Church, with which the Lords thought they had nothing to do.” But now it has broken down the ancient constitutional barriers; it “meddles” with that which it ever shrunk from meddling with before; and it is assuming the functions of a supreme authority over “the internal policy” and peculiar jurisdiction of the Church.

But has there not been given a “judicial interpretation” of the law against the Church? There has, and she submits that her constitutional rights and privileges have been violated by that interpretation. There are four kinds of statute law—civil statute law which is very voluminous indeed—criminal statute law, which is less so—fiscal statute law—and ecclesiastical statute law, which consists, comparatively speaking, of a very small number of acts of Parliament. Now the State has devolved the duty of interpreting and administering these various branches of the national code upon the Courts respectively, which have the charges of the corresponding departments. There is

no common interpreter. The interpretation of the Criminal Law by the Criminal Court is the only competent "judicial interpretation" by which the proceedings of that Court can be guided; and the interpretation of the statutes embodying ecclesiastical arrangements, by the Church Courts, is the only competent "judicial interpretation" by which these Courts are constitutionally bound to walk. A "judicial interpretation," thrust upon them by any other Court, for the purpose of compelling them to act contrary to their own conscientious view of the law, is an unauthorized and unlawful interference.

Five of the most eminent judges that ever adorned the bench, have declared their own Court to be in the wrong, and the Church to be in the right. Lords Glenlee, Moncrieff, Cockburn, Fullarton, and Jeffrey, have publicly announced their opinion, that the Church has both the law of the case and the constitution of the country on her side, and that the Court to which they belong has no right to order the performance of what it may conceive to be the Church's duty. We are standing up for the law. We are fighting the battle of the Constitution. The Constitution has been broken by the Court of Session's encroachments. We are striving—against, I admit, most fearful odds—to maintain ourselves on the ground, which the Constitution has assigned us. No partizan of the Civil Court has produced even the shadow of authority from the statutes of the realm, for the power it is grasping to regulate our ecclesiastical processes. The thing will never be done. By the statutes we are as independent of it as are the Courts of Justice and Exchequer; and our independence is far more solemnly secured. Messrs. ——— declare "the civil tribunals to be the great bulwarks of our freedom, civil and religious." Far be it from me to gainsay the statement! but this I will say, that the present most unequal struggle, in which the Church tribunals are engaged, has more to do than they are aware of with the interests of freedom, both civil and religious. We are opposing the breaking up of that happy distribution of forces, and powers, and jurisdictions, which our ancient national arrangements exhibit, and which forms the broad and durable basis on which our municipal liberties have been reared. We are setting our faces against centralization; and our argument, as a Church, with the country now is, that it is not good that any single giant power should grow up in the State, free from every check that is not self-imposed, and by which all other jurisdictions can, at pleasure, be overborne."

3. *The Anti-Establishment Theory.* This is the theory of all those who assume it as a first principle, that any alliance of the Church with the State is incompatible with its spiritual freedom and independence, as a true Church of Christ, and is, therefore, at once *inexpedient* and *unscriptural*. We do not advert to this theory, with the remotest view of introducing, in any shape or form, the *voluntary* controversy, into this land. There is nothing which we would deprecate more sincerely, or labour more earnestly to avert, so far as could be done without dereliction of duty, or violence to the dictates of conscience. To the advocates of this theory we give perfect credit for sincerity and conscientiousness; and we only claim the same in return, while cherishing the *Establishment principle*, as one founded alike in reason and scripture, and capable of being realized in perfect consistency with the maintenance of the Supreme Headship of the Redeemer, and the spiritual independence of his Church. At present, however, we only refer to the *existence* of the theory as a *matter of fact*, and to its consequent practical workings and effects on the recent controversy in Scotland.

The existence of such a theory need excite no surprise. Apart from

purely religious considerations altogether, there are elements in the mental constitution of man sufficient to account for it. As action produces reaction, and extremes beget extremes—the extreme of despotism leading to the extreme of anarchy, and the extreme of anarchy to the extreme of despotism—the extreme of superstition to the extreme of Atheism, and of Atheism to Superstition—the extreme of idealism to materialism, and of materialism to idealism;—so here. The extreme of Erastianism naturally drove men to the extreme of the Anti-Establishment principle. And the theory being once formed, the usual law of assimilative aggregation must come into play. All scripture texts, and facts of history, and views of expediency, must be drawn within the whirl of its vortex—and be subject to the plastic energy of its modifying influence, and made to roll around it, as so many obedient satellites—ministering to its wants and swelling its dignity by the mystic march and procession of an imposing retinue of high sounding plausibilities. Boldly and fearlessly is it then avowed that, between Church and State, there ought to be no connection at all—no statutory compact—no formal alliance—no official recognition. As if two independent sovereigns could not enter into any alliance for the promotion of objects of interest and importance to their respective dominions, without one of other sacrificing his dignity, his usefulness, and independence!—But, letting that pass,—Is it to be wondered at that the thousands, who entertained such ultra views of the impropriety, inexpediency and sinfulness of such a union, should misconceive, misconstrue, and often unconsciously misrepresent the real merits of the question,—the real objects aimed at,—and the real character of the leading champions on both sides?—That, in their earnest longings for the downfall of the establishment, their sympathies and antipathies should change places—that, utterly repudiating as they did, the theory of Erastianism or the Church's unconditional subjection to the State, they yet should, for a time, be seduced to think and speak well of the sayings and doings of the Erastians in Church and State, as these helped to confirm their favourite dogma, that it is impossible for an Established Church to be free, and served, by the extremity of their violence and injustice, to precipitate its disruption and ruin:—or that, cordially approving of the theory of Non-Erastianism, or the Church's Spiritual independence, they yet should be tempted, for a season, to think and speak ill of the proceedings of the Non-Erastian party in Church and State, as these, if successful, would pulverise or grind into atoms their favourite dogma—lead to a stronger confirmation than ever of the Establishment principle—and perpetuate the Establishment itself, purified and enlarged, to latest ages, on the triple adamantine basis of reason, scripture, and practical utility!

4th. *The Patronage Theory.*—This is the theory of those—and they number amongst them the wealthiest and most powerful in the land—who regard the church exclusively through *carnalizing media*;—viewing her as valuable chiefly on account of the secular *patronage* and influence she affords them in providing respectable, if not lucrative, “livings,” for their own friends or retainers. Those, who uphold it, steeped in sense, blinded by secularity, consumed by the crave of their own worldly appetites, and hood-winked by the adulations of greedy and unscrupulous flatterers,—dream of nothing, think of nothing, speak of nothing, and will hear of nothing, save “patrimonial rights,”—“civil duties and privileges”—and the “honours and prerogatives of wealth and property.” Thus, looking at the whole question as involving only *temporal* issues, interests, and results—and shutting out, as with bolts, bars, and battlements, all the more sublime and comprehensive views connected with indefeasible rights of conscience—liberty of private judgment—duty to the King of

kings—submission to the will of Heaven—the prerogatives of Christ's Crown and Covenant;—how can their judgments be otherwise than partial, mutilated, deformed? How can they but misapprehend the men who prefer the objects of faith to those of sense—the realities of eternity to the mocking phantasms of time—the bread of life and water of life to the perishable provision of a perishable body—the rights of the heavenly King to the usurpations of earthly potentates—the momentous interests of redemption here and glorification hereafter, to the calculations of filthy lucre here, and the breeze and sunshine of secular prosperity?

“But is not the church,” it has been asked, “bound to relinquish the power of nominating to her benefices, as an equivalent for the support and countenance which she derives from the State?” No such thing. To imagine any thing of the kind is a perfect fallacy. “No such equivalent,” as has been remarked, “is expected in the case of a friendly alliance between two independent powers, even although blood and treasure may have been expended in maintaining it. The proper way in which the State is remunerated for its external support, is by *the benefit which Society receives from the moral and religious influence of the Church, and not by robbing her of her privileges*, which may convert her into a political engine to serve the purposes of state empirics, but can never render her an effective instrument in promoting the public good. Neither the ancient kings of Israel, nor the early Christians who richly endowed the church in the apostolic age, nor some of the most munificent princes at a later period, ever claimed such a compensation from the church.”

Still, though the church be not bound to relinquish the right of nomination to her own benefices, in exchange for the support and countenance of the State, may not the Church of Scotland in point of fact, have made the surrender? This, indeed, has been gravely stated—and that too, by leading men on the *Moderate* side of the church. But never was statement, in an historical point of view, more absolutely incorrect. Let us hear Mr. Gray on the subject. “The reverend authors of a letter to the people of Scotland,” says he, “begin with an account of the origin and history of Patronage. They state, what every body knows, that Patronage took its rise, to a certain extent, from the circumstances of private individuals, in ancient times, building and endowing churches, at their own expense, and being allowed, in return, to nominate the ministers by whom these churches were served. But they state, farther, that, at the Reformation when Protestantism supplanted the religion of Rome, ‘the rights of patronage were carefully reserved to the heirs or representatives of the original donors,’ and that the early Reformers got the possession of the endowments ‘under the express condition of their being subjected to Patronage’; and they distinctly communicate the impression, that the existing Patrons of Scotland have derived their rights from the individuals by whom our churches were first built and endowed, either by inheritance, or by some other fair, honourable, and legal method either of conveyance.”

Now I am persuaded that Messrs. ——— believe their own narrative to be consistent with historical fact; but, notwithstanding their belief, it will require no lengthened detail to show that history is contradicted by nearly all they have said, and that never was narrative, not avowedly and intentionally fiction, more hopelessly at variance with fact. When the Reformation took place, there were about a thousand parochial charges, and the right of appointing to nearly *eight hundred* of these belonged to the church. Somewhere about *two hundred* formed the whole number that were subject to Lay Patronage. With almost *four-fifths* of the cures

Lay Patrons had nothing to do. By far the majority of the livings in Scotland had been appropriated to Abbacies, Bishoprics, &c.; and, with reference to the churches belonging to the livings appropriated, Lord Stair, the highest authority in matters of Scotch law, says that "*there was no Patronages of all these Kirks.*" When my reverend friends, Messrs. ———— therefore, assert that the State, in transferring the endowments from the purposes of Popery to the institutions of Protestantism, 'carefully reserved the rights of Patronage to the heirs or representatives of the original donors,' I am compelled to remark that, in nearly eight hundred parishes, there were no rights of Patronage to reserve; and, such being the case, it is for them to explain the possibility of 'a careful reservation' of rights that had no existence.

As Messrs. ———— have not stated the fact, I am under the necessity of mentioning that, for many years after the Reformation, the generality of the churches in Scotland were free from the operation of Patronage, and Ministers were admitted, not in consequence of the presentation of a Patron, but according to the rules of the church, "*upon the suit and calling of the Congregations and Parishes.*"\* It is true there were certain Parishes which were subject to Patronage all the while, but that class of Parishes formed merely a fractional part of the whole.† With regard to the generality, as has already been said, no rights were claimed or exercised by the 'heirs or representatives of the original donors:' none were reserved, and none belonged to them; and, in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred, these 'heirs and representatives' were probably unknown.

It is obviously helpful to the cause of which my reverend friends are the strenuous supporters, to speak of the existing Patrons of Scotland as 'the heirs and representatives of the original donors,' by whom our Churches were built and endowed; but the unbending and incontestable facts of history forbid them so to do. Well might Sir David Dalrymple, one of the Commissioners for the Union, observe, that 'if our Scotch Patrons were put to justify their title by the old maxim of the Canonists, *Patronum faciunt dos, aedificatio, fundus*, they would make but a very indifferent plea of it;' for the truth is, that King James the Sixth, after he assumed the government, unjustly and despotically created Patronages where none before existed, and, along with large portions of church property, bestowed them upon individuals of the nobility and gentry, who were neither the 'heirs nor representatives of the original donors,' and had no other claim to them than that which arose from the circumstance that they were his favourites for the time; and from these individuals the bulk of the patronages of Scotland have been derived to their present possessors. So indefensible was the conduct of the King in this matter, that Sir George Mackenzie, well known by the name of 'the Bloody Mackenzie,' with all his disposition to favour the stretches of arbitrary power, condemns it in the following terms:—'*There can be nothing so unjust as these Patronages were.*' '*These erections of new Patronages are extremely disadvantageous to the people, because one gentleman has thereby right to force Ministers upon all the other ancient and great Heritors of the Parish.*'" How alien Patronage, in any of its shapes, forms, or modifications, has ever been to the genius and constitution of the Church of Scotland; and how carefully and uninterruptedly it has

\* This is expressly stated in the Act 1640, c. 7.

† Keith, in his Appendix, gives a list of the non-annexed, and consequently patronate benefices. They are 262 in number. The patronage of so many of these, however, had belonged to Ecclesiastics, and lapsed at the Reformation. The "laick patronages," therefore, reserved by 1567, c. 7, "to the just and ancient patrons," may be fairly considered as somewhere about 200.



been excluded from all recognition in any of her accredited Standards, has already too abundantly appeared to require any further repetition.

5th. *The Unchanged Letter of the Law Theory.*—This is the favourite theory of certain renegade Non-Intrusionists, who shelter themselves under the allegation that the Establishment is *unchanged* in its principles and constitution by the final decision of the Civil Power, *because that decision made no change in the letter of the law*;—the inference being, that there was no valid reason for their renouncing the State benefices. Now, not to speak of the radical change effected by the *enacting* part of Lord Aberdeen's bill, it has been unanswerably proved, that, without any change in the *mere letter of statute law*, the *constitution* of the church, as understood and acted on by her faithful members ever since the Revolution settlement, was *utterly subverted and undermined*. And it was this undeniable subversion of her ancient treaty-protected constitution, which drove the noblest of her sons beyond her pale. But how, it may be asked, is this consistent with the admission of the letter of the law remaining the same? Let us reply in the words of Dr. Henderson of Glasgow. "It is obvious" says he "that it is a very possible thing to suspend the constitution of the church, while yet the terms of the statute establishing it remain unchanged. Why just look to the Church of Rome. The Bible is in the Romish Church just as it is in ours. They have not changed the statute book of heaven; but what have they done? They have changed the interpretation of that book; they have brought in another gospel which is not another; and just so with our Legislature, they have not altered the terms of the statute establishing the church, but they have altered the interpretation of the statute. I was struck the other day with a very significant passage in Chillingworth, where, in treating of prophecy, and adverting to the point I have just referred to, in regard to the power of interpretation when claimed to be authoritative, he says—"He that would go about (he is speaking of a man in power, a king or an emperor) to destroy the common liberty, needeth not to take the trouble to change the law; he has but to take on himself the right of interpreting the laws, or making additions to the laws, and then of giving to his interpretation the force of law; in other words, he has just to allow the laws to stand as they were, but to assume to himself the power of authoritative interpretation; in other words, to govern his country and his people by his laws, and his lawyers." This is the principle which strikes precisely on the point we now occupy. We had heretofore the interpretation of the statutes by which the church of Scotland was supposed to be established, and we have now a *new* interpretation put upon these statutes by the civil courts. And then in the matter of the right of interpretation, or rather of the power of giving effect to the interpretation, the civil courts, instead of saying that we should interpret these statutes for ourselves, have assumed to themselves the power of interpreting those laws which affect the consciences of Christ's ministers, and the effect of that interpretation is actually this, that they have come between us and Christ, interposing their authority between us and that of Him who is alone Lord of the conscience; and, in a matter which we hold to be a subject of direct legislation laid down to us by our Lord, they have interposed to legislate, and they have legislated, to the effect of holding us bound to act according to their views in matters connected with the administration and government of the church of Christ, and which are directly subversive of the great end for which the church of Christ is established, and over which the only power and authority is invested in the hands of the office-bearers of his church, for the edification of his body. Now, how will it ever be maintained that any such interpretation is binding on the consciences of the ministers of Christ? Is it reconcileable with Christ's great

law of love, or to be harmonised with that tender regard which Christ has to his people whom he holds as the apple of his eye? And are those whom He tenderly regards to be treated as if they had no name, or place, or influence?—are their interests to be sacrificed as being of infinitely less moment than the giving of a benefice to a presentee? This is such a horrid and monstrous perversion of every thing that is manly and right, that it is amazing at this time of day there should be a man, either in church or State, who can hold up his face, and say that this is to be the law in a church of Christ. It occurs to me as a solemn consideration, that never in the days of his flesh did our Lord, except once, or twice on the same occasion, put forth the strong arm of power, and that was when he made a scourge of cords, and drove the sellers and buyers out of the temple; and is it be imagined that the Lord, who never showed himself in that form except on that occasion, is to be held as giving his sanction to men in power, whether in the church or the State, to use force of arm to thrust in hirelings into places in the church, merely that they may have a piece of bread, come what may of the souls of the Christian people? In one word, in consequence of this *new* interpretation put upon the statutes, I could not continue to eat the bread of the Establishment, if I may so speak, because I see that the terms or conditions on which I entered it no longer exist, and I am bound by the law to do that which I believe to be the grossest outrage and violence on the rights of Christ's people, and of Christ himself. In that case I hold the obligation of my vows, taken when I entered that Establishment, to follow no divisive courses from that church as thus established—I hold that that obligation has ceased; and I believe that I am now upholding the church at this moment in the condition it was established."

6th. *The Priestly or High Church Theory.*—This is the theory of those who suppose that ordination, somehow or other, with or without Apostolic succession, confers on its subjects certain mysterious and undefinable powers, which give them an *exclusive* and *absolute monopoly* in the management of *all spiritual and ecclesiastical* affairs. Brought under the delusion of such a theory, they denounce any judging of ministerial qualifications, (such as the non-intrusion principle involves) on the part of the ordinary church members, as an encroachment on the peculiar province and functions of church rulers or governors—as a subversion of that spiritual jurisdiction, which the Lord Jesus Christ has committed to his ordained servants!

Now it has already, in various ways, abundantly appeared, that the Christian people have certain rights, duties, and responsibilities connected with the reception or rejection of ministers—even as ministers themselves have, who are already ordained;—and that the rights of the one party, as conferred by Divine authority, do not in any way interfere with, or supersede those of the other, as similarly conferred. The rights of both ought ever to be exercised, each in its own way, and for its own specific ends in constant and harmonious combination. (On the nature and limits of the rights of the Christian people, much has already been advanced. And as the subject is so important the following remarks relative to the nature and limits of the authority, which the Lord Jesus has conferred on the office-bearers of his church, from the pen of the Rev. Mr. Buchanan, late of the High church, Edinburgh, and author of the precious treatise on "Affliction," may not be unserviceable. "The authority" says he, which the Lord Jesus has conferred on the office-bearers of his church is not *absolute* but *limited*—not *lordly*, but *ministerial*. Jesus called the apostles to him and said, "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise *lordship* over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them; but so shall it *not* be among you.\* And

\* Mark x. 42.

Peter, "Neither as being lords over God's heritage;" "ye younger submit yourselves unto the elder"; yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility.\* And Paul, "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy."† "We were gentle among you, as a nurse cherisheth her children, so being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear to us."‡

There is a difference, then, which we are imperatively required to attend to, betwixt *LORDLY* and *ministerial* authority,—a difference in which mainly consists the contrast betwixt the Popish and the Protestant churches. Church authority is usually considered by divines, as consisting of three branches, known under the technical names of the potestas *δογματική*, the potestas *διαχειριστική*, and the potestas *δυστακτική*,—authority in points of doctrine, in cases of discipline, and in matters of church order. Now, while these three branches of church authority are generally recognised by divines of both persuasions, the grand difference between the Popish and Protestant Churches, or betwixt the lordly and ministerial authority, consists in these points: (1.) That the Popish church represents the authority as being absolute and binding on the conscience, irrespective of its being exercised in conformity with the word of God; while the Protestant reformed churches generally hold that it has no force to bind the conscience except in so far as its decisions have a ground, and warrant in scripture. They hold that whatever authority may be claimed as derived from the Lord Jesus, or as conferred by his warrant and commission, the primary obligation of all Christians is to obey Christ himself,—that this is in fact the ground and reason of the secondary obligation to obey those who, in virtue of His commission, claim authority over them, and that in no conceivable case, whether involving matter of doctrine, discipline, or order, can they be more bound to obey the office-bearers, than they are to obey the King and Head of the church.

A definite and discriminating principle which may serve to define the limits of church authority, and of the submission which is due to it, may we think, be deduced from the Headship of Christ—implying, as it does, the common relation which subsists betwixt Christ and all his people, and the mutual relation which subsists betwixt the office-bearers and the members of his church, as fellow-servants of the same Lord. All his people are directly related to Christ as their Head; and that relation implies the duty of subjection to his authority, as King in his own kingdom, as the supreme Shepherd and Bishop of souls. It is in virtue of this primary obligation that any portion of his flock are subject to the authority of those rulers whom he has appointed in his church; and those who are appointed to rule, are still fellow servants,—having no power but what is in its origin *derivative*, and in its nature purely *ministerial*. It is like the authority which one servant may claim to exercise over other servants of the same master—to whose will both are bound to submit, and to whose judgment both are accountable; an authority which cannot be claimed without the production of a clear warrant under the master's hand, nor ought to be extended beyond the clear terms of that warrant. The derivative authority of church rulers is neither co-ordinate, nor co-extensive with the authority of Christ, nor can it ever be pleaded as sufficient to supersede or evacuate any one of the rights, which He has conferred on his people, or the duties which he has required at their hands, "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." (Matt. ii. 23-8.)

\* 1. Pet. v. 3.

† 2. Cor. i. 24.

‡ 1. Thess. ii. 7.

(2.) But, supposing the authority of Church rulers to be purely ministerial, and limited by the warrant of scripture, the question arises, Who is to be the judge in such a case? Or, is there any earthly judge to whose decision both parties are bound to adhere? The standards of our church answer the question boldly in these memorable words: "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commendments of men, in any thing contrary to his Word, or beside it in matters of faith and worship." "And the supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion must be determined, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the scripture." "And the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."\*

How do these noble principles apply to the question of Non-Intrusion? They shew, that the Government which Christ has instituted in his church in the hands of spiritual office-bearers, leaves entire the right and duty of private judgment on the part of its members, and that, seeing the Lord Jesus has himself required his people to "try the spirits," and forbidden them to receive ministers not duly qualified, holding them responsible for their obedience to this command—the rulers of his church are bound; out of respect for Christ's authority, to have regard to the sentiments of the congregation, to be tender towards their consciences, and to refrain from coercing them.

It may be said, that, limited as the authority of church rulers may be, there must be vested somewhere, for the order and peace of the church, an ultimate power of decision, sufficient finally to determine cases of controversy. And so unquestionably there is; and that power is lodged with the office-bearers of the church,—they are empowered to decide ministerially in all questions of doctrine, discipline, and order. But, in doing so, in the exercise of that authority which rightfully belongs to them, they are bound to have regard, first, to the Word of God, and, secondly, to the sacred rights of private judgment; and while they resolutely resist any attempt to concuss *them* into an approbation or sanction of what they conceive to be sinful, they are bound scrupulously to avoid any attempt to concuss the people into a compliance with what *they* may regard as fitted to bring guilt or injury to their souls."

7th. *The Anti-popular Theory*—This is the theory of those who would deny to the Christian people any voice in the election of their pastors,—not because of any encroachment thereby on the self assumed monopoly of spiritual power by the ordained office bearers of the church, but because of the *alleged unfitness or disqualification* on the part of the people to exercise any such right or privilege at all. Those who uphold this theory, for lack of any valid or even plausible argument, deal liberally in abusive and opprobrious epithets;—designating the people, "A Mob—a prejudiced, vicious, unprincipled, worthless, factious, malicious, ignorant, splenetic capricious mob—whom no depth of learning, no soundness of doctrine, no purity of life and conversation, on the part of a presentee, can exempt from the danger of having his hopes blasted and his prospects sacrificed." And yet, many of the upholders of such a theory are among the foremost to plead the perfect fitness and competency of *the people* to elect Magistrates and Legislators, who have to grapple with the boundlessly complicated affairs, civil and criminal, commercial and political, economical and jurisprudential, of a mighty empire! As if the people who, in general, know little or nothing of the laws and statutes of the Realm, or the essential qualifications or actual duties of a Legislator, were nevertheless quite competent to

choose Civil Rulers ;—and yet the better informed and more sober, amongst them, who are well versed in the Bible, the statute-book of heaven, and well acquainted alike with the qualifications and duties of spiritual rulers or pastors, were wholly incompetent to exercise any voice in the election of the latter ! More egregious inconsistency could scarcely be found.

But, letting that pass,—the subject is sufficiently grave and important to demand a few additional remarks. We ask, then, Did not Christ and his Apostles exhort *all* believers as to sift and examine the doctrines taught to them ? Are they not enjoined “to try every spirit”—to “discern and beware of false prophets?”—Here is the *duty*—the imperative duty of all. And did Christ ever command things absolutely impossible ? Would it not be blasphemy to say that he did ? If so, does not commanded duty presuppose and involve the requisite ability as well as the necessary obligation to discharge it ? As to the former, is it not a subject of special promise ? Is it not a subject of special exhortation ? Did not the Apostle declare, that they were called in Christ to all perfectness of spiritual knowledge, and full assurance of understanding in the mystery of God ?

If, then, the people are ignorant and incompetent to judge, that is, incompetent to discharge one of their most incumbent duties, is not this a new call to enlighten, and strengthen, and qualify them for their duty ? Is it a reason why they should be debarred from their rights ? Is it not rather that they should know aright, and be able to exercise them aright ? If, through lack of sound teaching or preaching, the people be famishing, are they to be abandoned for their leanness, and insufficiency of strength ? If, through negligence, or worldliness, or ceremonial formalities on the part of pastors, the people be careless or indifferent about their rights and duties, is that a reason why they must be so, or continue to be so ? Have their eyes been put out, and must they be denounced as incapable of seeing ? Are the powers of the understanding debilitated, and must they be reproached for inability to comprehend ? Are their hearts hardened, and their consciences seared, through the negligence of spiritual shepherds, and must they be cruelly upbraided for unavoidable insensibility ? Is not all this a reason for rousing the people to see, to hear, to understand, to think, to feel ? Then, will they know and be fit to do all that ought to be done. Under a plentiful dispensation of the word, and ordinances, and prayer, accompanied by effusions of grace from on high, the people would soon be qualified. The poorest peasant and most illiterate, who has his eyes spiritually opened and his ears unstopped, his understanding illumined, his heart touched, his conscience quickened, will have a newly acquired but almost instinctive discernment of the difference between a faithful and a false gospel teacher. As by the glance of intuition he penetrates beneath the surface of exterior movements and speech—and, reaching the inner springs, pierces into the most secret recesses of the soul. He can hold converse with him in his chambers of imagery. He can depict and anatomize the thoughts and feelings. And finely can he scan whether grace be there—or an unction from the holy one there ? In languages which, by the mere worldling, whether Politician, or Judge, or Philosopher, may be utterly unintelligible, he can almost unerringly declare “That man cannot feed my soul.” But, though the great and the mighty on earth may see no meaning in that language—Angels in heaven do. The Divine Redeemer, who exhorted Peter to feed his lambs, does—the Holy Spirit, whose function is to give efficacy to the pure word, does—and God the Father, who so vehemently expostulated with the faithless Shepherds of Israel, does.

Who are best fitted to judge of the competency of an Astronomer or Geologist, a Metaphysician or a Geometrician, a Statuary or a Painter ?

Surely those who, in theory and practice, are deeply conversant in those branches of Art, or Science, or Philosophy. Suppose a man profound in Astronomy, or Geology or other Natural science, is he, in consequence, fit to judge of the merits of a Painter, or any other Artist of whose profession he is as profoundly ignorant? Can any art or science be named in which, if a person be trained for years, he cannot know whether a public professor of it teaches weakly or wisely? And must that competency be denied to one trained and disciplined in the School of Christ, which is never refused to the members of any other school? Must a man who is endowed with secular learning only, or perhaps with no learning at all, be a fit umpire and judge of the qualifications of a spiritual teacher; while he, who is endowed with spiritual knowledge and spiritual grace, is disenfranchised, because not possessed of high secular attainments? Let a man only meditate on the law of God, and like the Psalmist, he may become wiser than his teachers and more learned than the ancients, in the mysteries of divine truth and the realities of the divine life in the soul. Let him in practice walk habitually in the ways of godliness, and have a deeper experimental acquaintance with the workings of the spirit and the exercises of faith;—then will it be found that the essential requisites of a true gospel minister are not beyond his reach, capacity, or comprehension, however poor or illiterate—and that far from being disqualified, he is eminently endowed with that spiritual discernment which best can detect and judge of the fitness of a spiritual teacher to edify.

On this subject, we quote the following powerful statement from the pen of Dr. Chalmers:—

“There is much,” says he, “and that the weightiest part by far, of the internal evidence for Christianity, that rests on the adaptations which obtain between its objective truths and the felt necessities or desires of our subjective nature,—adaptations powerfully and intimately felt by many a possessor of that nature, who is yet unable to propound them in language, far less to state or vindicate them at the bar of judgment; and if ever the prerogatives of the human conscience were at one time more cruelly trampled on than at another, it has been within the last century, and at the bar of this House,—when the collective mind of a congregation, who both knew and loved the truth as it is in Jesus, has been contemptuously set at nought; and the best, the holiest feelings of our Scottish patriarchs, by lordly oppressors sitting in state and judgment over them, were barbarously scorned. In that age of violent settlements, these simple, these unlettered members of a rustic congregation could say no more, yet said most truly of the intruded minister, that he did not preach the gospel, and that, in the doctrine he gave, there was no food for the nourishment of their souls. I cannot imagine a more painful spectacle than such men as these—the worthies of the olden time—at once the pride and the preserving salt of our Scottish Commonwealth, placed under the treatment and rough handling of an able, jeering, ungodly advocate,—while coarse and contemptuous clergymen, booted and spurred for riding committees, were looking on and enjoying the scene; and a loud laugh from the seats of these assembled scorners completed the triumph over the religious sensibilities of men, who could but reclaim with their hearts and not with their voices. This was the policy of Dr. Robertson, recently lauded in high places—a policy which has dissevered our population from the Church, and shed the most withering influence over the religion of the families of Scotland! Re-enact this policy if you will, and you place your Kirk as a national establishment on the brink of its sure annihilation.”

8th. *The Indian Theory.*—This is the theory of those who fondly persuade themselves, and labour to persuade others, that the *territorial severance and distance* of Scotsmen from their native land—the scene of actual conflict

and disruption—exempts them from being in any way affected by the mighty ecclesiastical movement that is now progressing there. As if mere distance of time or place could alter the essential character of moral and religious principles—divine, immutable, ubiquitous principles! As if, in reference to these, right and wrong, truth and error depended on, and could be determined by, the *latitudes* and *longitudes* of *geography*, in much the same way, as the ever-changing characteristics of *climate*, through all gradations between the opposite extremes of the frigid and the torrid! But the time will come, when common sense breaking through the whole marshalled host of plausible sophisms, will decide, that, if it was ~~wrong~~ in Scotland for a Church of Christ to *submit*, in what is *purely spiritual*,\* to the *dictation* and *supremacy* of the State, it must be equally wrong for any of the members of that Church, in any part of the world, to *accredit* or *homologate* such *unscriptural submission* by remaining in *corporate union* therewith,—that, if it was *right* in Scotland to separate from such unscripturally submitting Church, it must be *equally right* in any part of the world, for any of its professed members, to separate from any *corporate* branch thereof.

The question, however, has still been asked:—"What have you to do with Non-Intrusion in India? Is it not your business to intrude?" It is our business to intrude the gospel on the notice of an *ignorant unconverted heathen* people—to urge, expostulate, enforce, and persuade, in order to the saving of their souls. But is this really the same thing as to intrude or force that on a *well taught and converted Christian* people, which they *know* to be unsavoury, unedifying, or even no pure gospel at all? But, though the controversy *originated* with the subject of Non-Intrusion, it gradually assumed a graver and vastly more serious aspect. So that, ultimately, the subject of Non-Intrusion itself became an altogether *subordinate* and *secondary* one. It was the *alarming nature* and *extent* of the *claims*, and *actual usurpation* of *spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction* by the Civil Courts, backed and sanctioned as these were, by the Supreme Legislature, which necessitated the disruption of the Church. Those who could not, in violation of conscience and the word of God, surrender the prerogatives of the great Head of the Church and the right and liberties of his ministers and people, at the unconstitutional dictation of the merely civil power, had no alternative but to protest and then separate. Those who, from whatever cause or aggregate of causes, contemplated the whole subject from a different point of view, and beheld it in a wholly different light, have remained behind.

"But what," it is still asked "have you, in India, to do with the subject? To civil interference with spiritual jurisdiction you are not exposed. At all events, you are not exposed to it in any way from which separation from the Establishment could form a protection." To this we reply, by at once granting that we are not *directly* and *immediately* exposed, in the *same way* as *we would have been at home*." But, then, are we not, part and parcel—limbs and members—of the great *corporation* of the Established Church? Must we not then be held as sanctioning and upholding its recognised principles, so long as we are closely and intimately united therewith, by communion or otherwise. Must not he who remains in visible, avowed, and corporate connection with Hinduism, Muhammadanism, Romanism, Church of Englandism, or Church of Scotlandism, or any other clearly defined system, be viewed, in the eye of reason, scripture, conscience, and common sense, as holding and promulgating all the peculiar and distinctive views and principles of the corporate or denominational body to which he is by profession and communion attached? In like manner, must not every baptized person, every communicant, and still more every office-bearer, connected with a particular Church by ordination vows, or the bonds of ordinary membership,

in whatever quarter of the globe, be accounted an *integral* and *corporate* portion of such church, so long as he visibly, and avowedly adheres to it? On the supposition, then, that any member or office-bearer of the Established Church of Scotland conscientiously believes that it has, at the unconstitutional dictation of the civil power, made an unscriptural surrender of great vital and fundamental principles, founded on God's Word, and her own ratified standards, what is he to do? If he remain in, openly avowing that he does so, at the expense of his principles, consistency, and honour, he is beyond the reach of argument and the pale of honest society. If he remain in, resolved to be altogether silent, or striving to maintain an irrational and impracticable neutrality, does he not as truly *identify* himself with the Residuary establishment, and as truly *acquiesce* in its Erastian principles and unscriptural submission to the civil power, as if he openly proclaimed his adherence to the same? What reasonable or honest course, then, is left for such as repudiate such submission, but to refuse—openly and fearlessly refuse—to acquiesce in the unscriptural enslavement of the once free and noble Church of his Fathers;—and so, by solemn protest and actual secession, wash his hands of the guilt of the sinful compromise, and cast in his lot with the Free-protesting Church, which, in all its grand and essential principles, he believes to be truly the ancient, reformed, covenanted Church of Scotland!

It is time, however, to bring these remarks to a close. We have endeavoured to classify and arrange some of the causes that have excited that tumult and confusion of opinions by which the recent Church and State controversy in Scotland has been signalized. In doing so, for the sake of convenience, we availed ourselves of Lord Bacon's celebrated classification of the "Idols of the Mind"—both on account of the authority of the noble author, and its currency in popular favour. At the same time, it must be obvious that some of the subjects do, from certain similitudes or common characteristics, so run into each other, like the serrated or obtruding edges of an irregular boundary line between two contiguous states, that it is not easy to define to which class they more properly belong. But this is not a matter of much consequence. We are no longer chained down to the verbal categories of the Schoolmen. And if the over-lapping of certain subjects, along the border or transition line, has led to something like occasional repetition of the same idea in another form, the importance of the general theme will be held as more than a warrant for so venial a fault.

There are many who imagined that when the disruption actually took place, the controversy would terminate. We never thought so. On the contrary, from the vital energy of the principles, the maintenance of which led to it—from the very frame and constitution of the human mind, when lacerated by a sense of wrong, and embroiled by the rebound of a cruel and unexpected and persecuting antagonism,—as well as from the lessons of past history, so fertile in monitions to all who read it, as the gradually unfolding roll of God's wondrous providence;—from these, and other causes, we always felt and always said, that *the disruption, in terminating one controversy, would only be the commencement of another and a mightier!*

We know that, in the end, peace and righteousness and love shall reign paramount in the habitations of men. But, in the mean while, the elements of moral disorder and confusion are abroad—not only in solution, but in conflict. Ere we can witness the desired precipitate, alike of *unity of spirit* and *uniformity of practice*, we may expect the commotion to increase tenfold, yea a hundred fold. And then cometh the end! It is a pleasing and felicitous conception of the English Poet, when, giving wing to his imagina-



tion amid the wild extravagances of Indian mythology, he depicts the physical elements, otherwise so turbulent and mutually hostile, harmoniously conspiring to frame a Palace for their fabled King :—

\* On that ethereal lake whose waters lie  
Blue and transpicuous, like another sky,  
The elements had reared their King's abode.  
A strong controlling power their strife suspended,  
And there their hostile essences they blended,  
To form a Palace worthy of the God,  
Built on the lake the waters were its floor ;  
And here its walls were waters arched with fire,  
And here were fire with water vaulted o'er ;  
And spires and pinnacles of fire  
Round watery cupolas aspire,  
\* And domes of rainbow rest on fiery towers,  
And roofs of flame are turreted around  
With cloud, and shafts of cloud with flame are bound.  
Here, too, the elements for ever veer,  
Ranging around with endless interchanging ;  
Pursued in love and so in love pursuing,  
In endless revolutions here they roll ;  
For ever their mysterious work renewing ;  
The parts all shifting, still unchanged the whole."

Beautiful, as a fiction of the Poetic Muse, is the representation here even of the transformed nature and mutual coalition of warring elements in the service of their imaginary King ! But, how much more beautiful, as contemplated in prophetic vision, the realized counterpart of all this in the moral world !—when the jarring and discordant elements of a heart that is "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked," shall drop their debased and savage natures, and harmoniously coalesce in rearing a spiritual and universal temple to Jehovah-Jesus, King of glory, King of Saints !—When appetites, given for purposes of wholesome nutrition, shall not degenerate into the excesses, whether of a gross, or a refined epicurism ;—when the social principle, no longer associated with worthless attachments, or the promotion of class, or caste, or clannish interests, shall ally and intertwine itself with the aspirations and projects of universal charity ;—when firmness and courage and manly energy, no longer shrivelled into the spirit of contention, stubbornness, provocation, warfare and strife, shall impart fresh vigour to the promptings of philanthropy, as well as to the varied manifestations of every power and faculty of the soul ;—when prudence, dis severed from its corruption into cunning, duplicity, or deceit, shall re-ascend into its glorious original of a wise, forecasting providence, anticipating and providing for the evolutions of mighty designs ;—when self-love, no longer shrunken into selfishness or self-conceit, shall rise into the dignity of self-respect and personal independence, and cordially unite with disinterested benevolence, in a lively sympathy with the felicity and enjoyment of all sensitive creatures ;—when the sentiments of veneration, hope, and awe, no longer linked with the phantasms, the prodigies, and the fictions of an absurd and senseless superstition, shall find their fitting objects in the glories and sublimities, which are revealed in the magnificent Economy of Redemption ;—when enlightened reason, no longer glorying in the deceptive fruits of its own inflated impotence, will proclaim itself the handmaid of heavenly faith, no longer confounded with the mimicries of an earth-born crudulity ;—when all the intellectual and rational faculties, braced, invigorated and sanctified, shall become the stay and support, the directors and the guides

of the varied feelings, affections and impulses of the renewed heart ; and the purified feelings, affections, and impulses of the heart shall confer life, and grace, and ornament on the upholding and directive powers of the sanctified intellect ;—and when all the regenerated energies, and susceptibilities of the soul shall conspire to dedicate, in happy and fraternal union, the height and might of their services to the rearing of shrines and altars, palaces and thrones, to the glory and honour of our adored Immanuel ! Blessed and glorious consummation ! Who would not long and pray to see it realized ? But realized it shall be, in God's own good season. And then ;—when faith is swallowed up in vision and hope in actual fruition—shall the heirs of millennial glory be privileged, in retrospect, to take up the verified song of THE COURSE OF TIME ;—saying—

“ Love took the place of law ; when'er you met  
A man, you met a friend, sincere and true.  
Kind looks foretold as kind a heart within ;  
Words as they sounded, meant ; and promises  
Were made to be performed. Thrice happy days !  
Philosophy was sanctified, and saw  
Perfections that she thought a fable, long.  
Revenge his dagger dropped, and kissed the hand  
Of Mercy ; Anger cleared his cloudy brow  
And sat with Peace ; Envy grew red, and smiled  
On Worth ; Pride stooped, and kissed Humility ;  
Lust washed his miry hands, and, wedded, leaned  
On chaste Desire ; and Falsehood laid aside  
His many-folded cloak, and bowed to Truth ;  
And Treachery up from his mining came  
And walked above the ground with righteous Faith ;  
And Covetousness unclenched his sinewy hand,  
And opened his door to Charity, the fair ;  
Hatred was lost in love ; and Vanity,  
With a good conscience pleased, her feathers cropped ;  
Sloth in the morning rose with Industry ;  
To Wisdom, Folly turned ; and Fashion turned  
Deception off, in act as good as word.  
How fair the daughter of Jerusalem then !  
How gloriously from Zion hill she looked !  
Desire of every land ! the nations came,  
And worshipped at her feet ; all nations came.  
The East, the West, the South, and snowy North,  
Rejoicing met, and worshipped reverently  
Before the Lord, in Zion's holy hill ;  
And all the places round about were blest.  
The desert blossomed, and the barren sung.  
Justice and Mercy, Holiness and Love,  
Among the people walked ; Messiah reigned ;  
And Earth kept Jubilee a thousand years.”

## II.—EXODUS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

- 1.—*To the people of Scotland in general, and in particular to the Friends of the Church of Christ throughout the land, the Affectionate Representation of Ministers and Elders, &c.* May 1843.
- 2.—*Pastoral Address by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland,* June 1843.

For many a year had the dust gathered over the Royal Symbols of our ancient kingdom, and we had almost come to regard them as lost. At length, however, it is hinted that they may still be in existence, and a search is instituted for them. They are sought for amid the fears, and found amid the acclamations of a people who seemed doing homage to their monarch, as they beheld the Regalia which once encircled his brow. And, as we ourselves have stood in the dark and guarded chamber, where the venerable relic was stored, and saw not only the diadem's golden frame uninjured, but every gem in its setting, our hearts were filled with patriotic ardour, and we felt at once more loyal and more free.

But a nobler crown than that of Scotland's ancient Princes has of late been searched for and discovered. Not more did our father's revere the crown of those who were their earthly sovereigns, than they did the Crown of Zion's King; and they hung it round his Cross, so that as often as they looked to the one, they might also see the other. Christ's royal supremacy was with the founders and martyrs of our Church an article of faith.

Their children were not always so loyal to the 'Prince of the kings of the earth.' Never did they *openly* barter away his crown, and place his sceptre *avowedly* in foreign hands. But these royal ensigns of our 'Royal Priest,' they did suffer to be locked up in dishonourable neglect, until they had fallen out of mind. All at once, however, it comes across men's thoughts that Christ's crown used to be spoken of and admired in Scotland. It is whispered too, where it may yet be found. Our repositories are not searched in vain. That which we enquired after, and for which our fathers struggled, comes into sight, most carefully preserved in the arguments of our learned men, the confessions of our martyrs, the standards of our reformers, and the articles of our Church. Our eyes again 'look upon King Solomon wearing the crown wherewith our mother crowned him in the day of his espousals, and in the day of the gladness of his heart.'

Thoroughly unprofitable, however, if not insincere, would have been the doctrinal admission of Christ's Headship, unless, at the same time, it were maintained in effect and detail; and worse than affectation would it have been, to admire the achievements of our ancestors in the cause of religious freedom, if we were not prepared to resume their testimony, and enterprize. Suppose, that as one walked round the ancient diadem of this ancient kingdom, he saw a hand stretched forth to rifle it of its gems, though its frame he cannot break, would he not resent the act as not less unhalloved than to steal the crown itself? But this was the very thing vain men attempted with the 'other Crown, which signifies another kingdom within this realm.' Remove the obnoxious emblem, now drawn from its neglect and dishonour they could not: it was too strongly guarded by the strong. Neither could they deny its existence,—it is too clearly discerned by all. They cannot even twist its frame, or alloy the gold thereof,—it will not yield in their impious hands. What then shall they resolve upon? They must empty it of its

jewels! They will accord to Jesus all his challenged prerogatives with their lips,—but at the same time, they deny to his people all their Cross-bought rights. This is the Crown without its gems!

Beyond all doubt, the standing of the Christian people in the choice of their pastors is a truth of God,—a gift of Christ,—and besides, it is coeval with the introduction of Christianity into these lands, wrought into the history of the Scottish nation, and the texture of the Scottish Church. At times the privilege was overborne by tyrannical princes, and almost extinguished by rapacious nobles. No sooner, however, did the truth any where revive, than this grand distinction of the evangelical economy revived along with it. Nor was it one of those minor details, at least in our case, which was grafted on a system by time, or slipped into it by chance. It was a principle deeply weighed, elaborately vindicated, and strenuously maintained by those who built our Zion, and they laid it among the stones of her foundation. It was a legacy from the apostolic Culdees, and which they bequeathed to us at the cost of many sufferings. It was a stronghold of our mighty Reformers, which neither to sovereign nor peer, they ever would surrender, and it even formed a distinguished part of their protest against Antichrist. It was an article of faith, with the godly of other days, and as soon would a believer deny the Lord who bought him, as renounce his Christian liberty.

If not the Crown then,—at least that for which the Crown was ever worn,—was involved in the Non-Intrusion controversy; and assuredly, had that principle not been contented for at all hazards the designs of the Redeemer's Headship would have been betrayed. Spiritual power in the hands of the Church, is power derived from Christ, and exercised by him. Spiritual power in the hands of patrons is power alienated from the Redeemer, and rendered to the world. Here then, compromise would have been treason. But the Church was upright and firm. After a night of darkness, sad and soul-destroying as ever Popery brought on, the spirit of our fathers returned to their children, and in the name of Christ we demanded our freedom of those who had spoiled us of it. 'Had I some of that very blood,' said Bernard, 'which was poured forth on the cross, how carefully would I carry it in my golden vessel; and ought I not to be as jealous of those souls and those gift, that blood was shed for?' This elevated spirit had now fallen upon our Church, and under its influence we resolved to gather up all our rights. 'The people of England,' said M'Crie to the House of Commons, 'have an hereditary prejudice against political despotism; and I glory to say that my countrymen have an hereditary prejudice against Ecclesiastical despotism.' This character our Church has again fully redeemed. At every sacrifice, has she stood faithful to our insulted Master, and has been honoured above all other Churches, to throw the shield of protection over the rights of his people.

It was in 1834 that the struggle on behalf of Christ and his Church commenced upon the arena of our General Assembly, and during all the interval from that early date it has been earnestly carried on. Many have been the forms it has assumed,—gradual the steps by which it has risen to its present magnitude,—various the fields on which it has been waged,—unexpected the turns it frequently has taken,—intense the anxiety it awakened,—sanguine the hopes, and resolute the efforts it called forth, on either side,—each year its influence spread,—and it has not closed, until, for good, or for evil, it has enveloped the world. It is, however, one remarkable feature in this mighty contest, that whilst our opponents uniformly succeeded in all their aims and measures,—as if to shew who it was that sustained them, and likewise to shut them up to the alternative God meant they should adopt,—the Evangelical party never had even a single vote or

judgment in their favour beyond the decisions of their own courts, but were worsted at every step from the outset. In almost every other instance of warfare, be it political or military, success vibrates from side to side, and both fortune and defeat are equally divided until the final blow is struck. But here, Erastianism had all along its own way,—whilst nothing but reverse and disappointment awaited the cause of Christian liberty. It is perhaps not unworthy also of notice, that long as the conflict has lasted, the respective armies are identically the same in 1843 as in 1833. At all events during the considerable period of ten years which has elapsed betwixt this and the first threatening of hostilities, not one of the leaders on either side has been removed by death.

At length, however, the sound of combat is stilled, the old arena of strife is clear, the very smoke of battle is passing away. We do not speak either of success or of defeat. For though the field is quitted, no party claims a victory, far less prepares to celebrate a triumph. The combatants are drawn off but not disbanded. Now, is there a breathing time, as if the first campaign were closed. But, neither side apprehends that the war is terminated, or feels satisfied with the issue. Nothing less did the Evangelical majority aim at, than to apply their principles *within* the Establishment, as well as to vindicate them before the Church of Christ; and this design has been thoroughly frustrated. The Moderate leaders on the other hand, had resolved to bring back the Establishment to those peaceful times, when their opponents were content to cushion all their principles on some imbecile protest, and then enact the scenes they had most indignantly denounced. But so far from this being the position to which they have attained, it is not hid even from their own eyes, that they have but exchanged the fatigue and perplexities of intestine commotion, for the skill and perseverance, and daring of regular warfare. Vain men! They thought to have broken or sheathed anew the sword of Christian freedom. But in the onslaught the scabbard has been thrown away, and this is all their gain!

The late events which have taken place in connection with our Church, came on our rulers utterly by surprise, we are convinced; and as a political blunder, therefore, this is melancholy indeed. A crisis had been developed, a catastrophe was on the eve of explosion by which the empire will be unsettled, nay, shaken; yet this juncture is not known in high places, for had it been apprehended, sure we are, it would have been provided against in a way far different from what we have seen. The mistake, however, into which our men in power have fallen, in regard to recent transactions, is more lamentable still, viewed as a calculation which had too long, and too largely, been justified by their experience of the clergy. We desire to speak advisedly on this point. But using the utmost caution, we cannot but admit, that for the most part, if not uniformly, for a great while back, the Government of the day had found our ecclesiastical incumbents ready to subordinate their conscience to their stipend—and of this error they were not at all likely to be disabused by their Moderate advisers in the present case. What although, then, the Convocationists have recorded their principles, and avowed their designs, and published their names; so deep is the prevalent conviction that a minister will part with nothing for the truth that in this belief the leaders of Moderatism and the heads of Government persisted to the last.

It was melancholy indeed to think that use and wont gave countenance—warrant—to such an infidel imputation. It was still more lamentable to find that a great administration had so far compromised their own honour, as to deal with our clergy on the principle that they were no better than simpletons or knaves. But most appalling above all to know, that there was a section in the Church who ratified, if they did not originate, the views

on which Government acted, and who by the estimate they formed, and spread, in regard to their brethren of the Convocation, have openly avowed that in no circumstances shall *their* principles interfere with their interest, but that they would cleave, at the bidding of men in power, to their manes and emoluments, though they must give their Bible to the winds, and cry to the Saviour in derision, 'Hail, King of the Jews.' Of all their acts and speeches, the utter scorn with which the Moderate party treated the idea of a sacrifice for conscience sake, by men pledged before their country, their Church, and their God, indicates most clearly to our minds, the irreligion—the infidelity—of the class. And this impression is only enhanced when we recollect the eagerness they have shown, and the artifices they have used to tempt back to their ranks any one who might be inclined to write himself a hypocrite, or coward, by returning amongst them, not only in the face of his Convocation pledge, but after having subscribed 'the Act of Separation and Deed of Demission.'\*

In addition to those ignominious views which Government entertained of the unblushing meanness of those with whom they were dealing, it was, we regret to affirm it, their miserable policy, and even their confident hope; that they would be able at least to detach the bulk of the Non-intrusionists from their beloved and devoted champions, and in that way bring the entire odium and bitterness of the dismemberment upon the heads of those generous men who had so mightily and disinterestedly fought in the van of this great battle. A politician cannot reason without the circle, or feel above the level of a politician; and what, accordingly, they had themselves done over and over again, as partizans in their own warfare, our statesmen judged it would be no hard thing to get the clergy of the Church of Scotland to do in the crisis of *their* need. Because Whigs and Tories scruple not to shake off allies and leaders who are of no service when the glittering rewards of the Treasury are in view, but trample them in the dust, with all obligations and friendships, rather than hazard their own aggrandizement or security, so our great men never doubted that the mass of the evangelical square would at once step to safety and promotion over the ashes of their chiefs.

"Blessed be the Lord, who hath not given us as a prey to their teeth! Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the fowler's snare—the snare is broken, and we are escaped." Nay; has not the fowler become a reproach, and a scoffing-mark to all generations? Our rulers laid it down, that as clergymen, the Non-intrusionists were devoid of all rectitude—that as Convocationists, they had no generosity. And then by subtle correspondence, and ample flattery, and unscrupulous promises—by profane adjuration of 'the God of truth,' and dark hints of treason—by every artifice of Abithophelian ingenuity, and every form of bold asseveration—by all the meannesses of aristocratic sycophancy, and even the labours of ermined judges, who stepped down from the grave bench to supplement their verdicts by epistles and *purchases*, as the case might need, an effort was made, as desperate as it was wicked, to break down our strength, and scatter our host. No adequate and full handed measure was proposed, so that all need for secession might be taken away; but all that practised dexterity could do was done to weaken it. And we have no doubt, that after he had succeeded in duping for a season the amiable defender of our cause in the House of Peers, by statements which do indicate a taste for refined diplomacy, the Secretary for

\* Our conviction is, that even though there had been no other ground in Providence for the Secession, it was a matter of absolute necessity, in order that the real servants of Christ might be purged from the stigma of unscrupulous selfishness, and be again invested with that reputation for high-minded integrity, which they had lost, and could not have regained in the Establishment.

foreign affairs felt almost sure that he had aimed 'a heavy blow and great discouragement' at the threatened schism in the Scottish Church. Our great opponent would, to use his own phrase, 'lay his head upon his pillow, on the night of the 11th of May, in the confident belief, that for once at least, truth was not a match for error, but that Christian simplicity had fallen before one not inferior to Talleyrand in anything but unquestioned genius.

The dream, however, was soon and rudely dissipated. On Monday the 15th of May 1843, the Convocation resumed its sittings, and the number that attended even its first council evinced that its ranks were as solid and unbroken as ever. Since it rose in November, two things had occurred which went to ascertain explicitly the mind of Government on our claims, and fix the position of the Church. Sir James Graham had spoken out with creditable frankness, in his celebrated "letter," and a vote had been taken on our question in the House of Commons. If the reply of the Home Secretary left nothing to be hoped for, so far as administration was concerned, the attitude of Parliament was more unequivocally hostile. An opening, however, again seemed at hand, from certain conversations which had taken place in the House of Lords betwixt the Marquis of Breadalbane and the Earl of Aberdeen, so recently as the week before the Convocation met. And the first point, therefore, which the Convocation felt it proper to determine, was, the amount of what noble Lords had lately been proclaiming, and the real temper of Ministry in regard to our case up to the last intelligence. There were some of the brethren whom the audacity of the Foreign Secretary, and the too facile credulity of his interrogator, had staggered,—and they were almost inclined to imagine that at length our rulers had been made to see the true interests of the nation. We should have regretted this disposition to linger, or pause, had it led even to a momentary distraction of views, or the slightest appearance of vacillating timidity. But it was nothing more than the salutary caution of men in whom reigned the fear of God, and who felt that it would be no less a sin to anticipate, than to retard the designs of Providence. No sooner, accordingly, had Dr. Gordon, first, in a strain of burning eloquence, which reminded us forcibly of his speech in the Presbytery of Edinburgh many years since, against Catholic Emancipation; and afterwards Mr. Campbell of Monzie, in a speech not less animated and effective, shown that the ultimatum of the State, as well as the Government, had now been declared in the official answers given to our 'Claim of Rights,' so that even to suppose a change of sentiment on the part of those who held our destiny in their hands, would be not so much preposterously foolish on our part, as intolerably insulting to them,—than the whole body became on one mind, and it was carried, almost by acclamation, we may say, that no alternative remained, but to leave the Establishment without delay.

The next question was, as to the manner in which the resolution now adopted might best be carried out;—and here the same gratifying unanimity prevailed. Many felt that it would have been desirable to renew once more, and for the last time, a discussion in the General Assembly, of the great principles at issue. But now that the State, speaking through all her organs, had refused a place in the Courts of her Establishment to the *quoad sacra* ministers; to have insisted on their retaining their places, would have been disobedience to the law of the land in a matter it has a right to fix. At the same time, to supersede the status of these brethren, as rulers in the house of God, on the mandate of the civil power, would have been disobedience to the law of Christ in a matter clearly within its scope.\* A course,

\* Another element entered into the case. Commissioners to the Assembly had been

therefore, it was requisite to discover, by which the Church might at once render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and reserve in all their integrity to God the things which are God's.

The expedient to be followed was at once arranged. It was agreed that before the Assembly had constituted, a protest against it as unconstitutional and unfree, should be taken by the Convocationists, and that forthwith they should retire to form themselves into a separate court. The policy of this course we greatly admired, as it broke up the Church upon no isolated point of dispute, but on a ground that embraced all the principles we had been contending for. We did not less admire the protest itself—but feel constrained to view it as a document which was quite worthy of the occasion that had called it forth, and of the place it must occupy in the future history of our land.

The arrangements, made with so much care and vigour for conducting the separation in a way suitable to its nature and magnitude, as at once a religious movement and a national crisis, were through the good providence of God answering the prayers of his saints, carried into effect with every mark of solemnized feeling and impressive order. It is apparent that the Queen's Letter produced to the Assembly by the commissioner, was framed on the idea that a motion would be attempted by the evangelical party to dissolve the connection betwixt the Church of Scotland and the State and no unintelligible warning was prepared for those who might hazard a procedure so inexpiable! *'The settlement, said the letter, fixed by the act of the British Parliament, cannot be annulled by the will or declaration of any number of individuals. The union of the Church of Scotland with the State is indissoluble.'*

This pompous threat was a vain shaft, and only indicated how calamitously ignorant the Ministry were of our real position. Certain we are, that even although the menace had been launched in regular assembly, it would have fallen to the ground contemptuously unheeded. But its edge was not tried. Ere the time was come to draw the weapon, the resolutionists whom it was meant to intimidate, had hastened away from the chains and bars of an Erastian prison-house, to assert their liberty in more propitious circumstances. We cannot, however, refrain now from acknowledging, that even had the secession not taken place before it was tabled, the document just alluded to, must have of itself created the necessity for such a step, even from the postulatium with which it sets out, than the wretched policy it unfolds. Without mask or mitigation, it asserts that from the moment when the union is constituted betwixt Church and State, the bond is 'indissoluble,' so far as the former party is concerned, and that any proposal to break up the alliance would be a contravention of the law. It has come to this then, —let the state interpret the acts by which we are established as it pleases; or let the Church in her collective conscience be persuaded that her terms of union, perhaps the union itself, are at variance with the mind of Christ,—nevertheless, until the State shall grant permission, the Church cannot relinquish her compact. The State may at any time repeal the statutes of Establishment, and set the Church adrift; but on no account may the Church withdraw from her position, and cease by her own act to be established. Is it not clear, therefore, that the whole question of Church Establishments must be revised, and the new elements for a right judgment on the point which have been so rapidly accumulating of late, taken into account when we find so monstrous a doctrine as this, promulgated from high quarters? The

interdicted from taking their seats, and an entire presbytery had been disfranchised by interdict. These interdicts, however, were but another form of the *quoad sacra* question, and determined by it.



grand principle of Establishments we never can surrender or qualify. But this adherence to our former convictions, is not at all inconsistent with this farther view, that a Christian Establishment can only safely exist in union with a Christian Government.

We do fear now, and our fear is grounded on the experience of our Church for three centuries, that in the treatment of a church by ungodly statesmen, one of two things will ever be aimed at: Either they will take care that it is viciously constituted, or that it is viciously administered. They do not ask for both alternatives, nor have they, in all likelihood, a preference of the one to the other. But give them you must, either a corrupt system, or corrupt management. We cannot, therefore, be surprised, should it now be felt that the union of Church and State, upon an evangelical platform, is, in the present condition of civil government, very hopeless, and that Establishments, having done the work they were fitted for, must be laid aside to prepare the way for the theocracy of the Great King, when he shall 'take to himself his great power and reign.' At all events, the present administration have done what they can to advance the triumph of Voluntaryism. For, according to them, a church is not so much united to the State, as incorporated with it. An Establishment implies, they tell us, not a mere tenure of alliance, but a deed of absorption. From the moment that the State establishes the Church, these twain become one, and one in no other sense than this, that the State is paramount, and the Church only an ingredient in the general result of a political constitution. The Queen's letter was thus something more than Moderate Erastianism. It was entrenched in downright and unblushing Hobbism.\* Not only does it make the Church the creature of the State; it proceeds to swallow up the creature it has made. An establishment is a device for making the Church not merely the property, but the prey of the State—its victim, even more than its vassal. Bad enough to know that we had no freedom; but the pitch of degradation was it to be told, that we had no existence as a Church! Even had there been no previous ground of separation, this would have forced us to the door. It would have done more than justified the step—it must have rendered it imperative. And they who, in spite of this broad assertion of Hobbesian tyranny, are still without compunction satisfied to abide in the Establishment, must be

\* It would be much better when Sir James is deriving so much from the old school of political infidels, that he spoke out with all their frankness. Why not let him say with Spinoza, borrowing from Hobbes, 'I hold that States are not bound to observe their treaties longer than the interest which first led to the treaties continues.' What Spinoza wrote, Sir James Graham has done. If Sir James is anxious for the countenance of ultra-religionists, as well as above-proof infidels, let him turn to No. I. of 'Tracts for the last Days,' just issued by Irving's followers, and he may read this to his comfort, 'the question of union betwixt Church and State, is not one which man is at liberty in these days to discuss, for he has not the power to annul that relationship.' Kant, we suspect, had clearer notions than either Sir James or Mr. Drummond on these points, for in enumerating 'the criteria of the real Church,' he says, *Tertio*, 'The relation under the principle of liberty, of its members to one another internally, and of the Church externally, to political might, are both as in a free-state.' *Quarto* 'As to modality—its constitution is immutable, with the reserve according to time and circumstances, to alter the casual arrangements, so as to bring out the idea of its end.' The best metaphysics, however, are sure to evaporate when they touch the arid ground of politics. And very likely Kant would have been as great an Intrusionist as his fac-simile, Sir William Hamilton. At least, when metaphysical subtlety, and sceptical leanings meet, the Church has little to expect. In the famous case of Bertelieri, Calvin had said, 'I will imitate Chrysostom, and though I cannot oppose force to force, let me be massacred before these hands present the holy sacrament to those who have been judged unworthy.' And thereon, Bayle remarks, 'This appeal to Chrysostom, is an artful way of threatening the government with insurrection.' Metaphysical politics and political infidelity bring forth the same fruits in all ages.

prepared for any claim the State may put forth, or any abasement it may exact. Episcopacy, all rank with the perfumes of popery will be but the gnat—the camel has been fairly bolted.

Before the time, however, for receiving the royal Letter had arrived, the arrangements agreed upon at the Convocation were carried into full effect, and ere the Assembly of 1843 was constituted, the Evangelical party, with all their concurring friends, had withdrawn from the house. **IT WAS ON THURSDAY THE EIGHTEENTH OF MAY** that his greatest event of modern times took place. It was something to have a bright sky above our heads on this occasion—and we had this. The firmament was without a cloud, and the earth was calm—a day of serene tranquillity—of Sabbath-rest. Nor was it less calm, and tranquil, so far as the eye could reach, within the walls of the Assembly. As in the purest sky, we still know that the elements of storm are there, so too, as we looked across the Assembly, as all rose up for prayer, we could not but remember that *there too* were the materials of wrath, and that in an instant a stray spark might light the train. We stood until the prayer was finished in high suspense. But no evil sign appeared. Through God's good providence we possessed the chair in the person of Dr. Welsh, and no sooner had the house resumed their seats than, with intrepid bearing, he lifted up, and read the Protest of the Convocation. It was of considerable length and deliberately given. But, during the whole time it occupied, all was breathless silence. No attempt was made either to cheer, or to disconcert. And having closed it—folded it up—delivered it to the clerk without any great formality—slightly, but courteously, acknowledged the Commissioner, the Moderator, with all who adhered to him, immediately withdrew. It might appear as if there should have been words of parting, and tears of sorrow, and blessings from all sides, when so wide and final a separation was concluded. No; the separation is a high-minded and public divorce, and almost with impatient haste the injured spouse casting upon the floor the ring and dowry of her unfaithful husband, resigns his home for ever!

There cannot be a doubt that their opponents, as well as those around the throne, were struck with more than surprise, as they witnessed the numbers, and deportment of those who filed off, seat after seat. Up to the last moment hopes had been conceived of thinning their ranks, if not of subduing their spirit. But how utterly delusive all such expectations had been, was now proved to the dismay of the most sceptical, and by a result not more disastrous than irretrievable. Surely some misgivings came, at this moment, over the heart of those whom history will charge with all the evil. To them, at least, this could not be the hour, either of satisfaction or of triumph. From the bottom of our heart we wished that those men who had laid so ruthlessly the axe to the root of our hallowed vine, had been obliged, like their expatriated brethren now, to confront their assembled countrymen, under the eye of day—and even *their* steeled hearts, we venture to predict, would have sunk beneath the tempest of scorn which would have proclaimed a nation's wrath. On the other hand, if ever a noble sacrifice upon the altar of truth was promptly acknowledged, and richly rewarded, it was when the cheer that broke from the vast multitude who waited for the retiring brethren at the door of the Assembly, assured them that as it was the nation's battle they had fought, so the nation's heart was with them. Never did men walk into open day with an erecter gait, or more confidently challenge the approval and sympathy of their fellow-citizens. But with instant and simultaneous shout ten thousand voices testified that, though 'cast down we were not forsaken,' and that the hour of defeat on the arena of the Assembly, was the hour of triumph on the field of Christendom. It was a sight of more than usual

interest—of interest intense and subduing—to look on **FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY** servants of Christ, accompanied with not fewer than one thousand devoted elders, turning their back upon all the comforts of life, and abjuring the Church of their fathers. Doubtless they called to mind, at this martyr hour, their peaceful manes lighted up with all the brilliancy of a cloudless sunshine, but which were to be theirs, their children's, no more,—that Church too, for which they had often struggled, and which, but for them, would now have been a ruin. No wonder, then, if their hearts were troubled, and their air solemn. The ground seemed to shake under their tread. A Sabbath's stillness reigned. And as we turned on either side to scan the ranks of those who lined the venerable procession from George's Street to Tanfield, we could mark 'the daughters of Jerusalem weeping,' and even her firmer sons.

Yet was it no funeral procession, all sackcloth and cypress. No! It was the procession of Israel from Egypt to the wilderness, it was the procession of the Ark from the house of Obadedom to the city of David; it was the procession of the Church, from the yoke and fetters of servitude, to the 'wide and wealthy place which the Lord had prepared.' 'Go ye forth of Babylon,' was the Lord's voice to us, 'flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the end of the earth. Say ye, the Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob. For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands.' Accordingly, the enfranchised Church had scarcely entered her own hall, than grief was forgotten, and all was praise and joy. 'Thou hast put off my sackcloth, and girded me with gladness, to the end that my glory may sing praise to thee, and not be silent. O Lord my God, I will give thanks unto thee for ever!'

We cannot refrain from saying here, that the hall in which the Free Church was accommodated, with its lathless wall and unplastered roofs, its air of economy, yet aspect of magnitude, was in admirable keeping with the use it was meant to serve. Had we assembled in some gorgeous room of the city, or under the dome of one of its splendid churches, we should have felt that this was incongruous. The decoration would have been at variance with our poverty, there would have been restraint too from old associations, and the stream of former times constantly rushing over our thoughts, would have mingled painfully with the new current that had begun to flow. We do feel very grateful, therefore, for having obtained a hall which at once developed the spirit of freedom amongst us, and proclaimed our strength, whilst at the same time it always put us in mind, that we had not builded our temple on Mount Zion, but only pitched our tabernacle in the wilderness.

Considering what was witnessed in another Assembly, where the contempt of the audience assailed the hapless court at every step, though few were the spectators, it would not have been astonishing had it been found difficult at times to wield the minds of the three thousand, who day after day crowded the hall of the Free Church. But not one untoward event occurred,—no jarring, no inconvenience. From the commencement, the Assembly of the Free Church resolved to take the Christian public along with them. And never did there rise a more cordial response of enthusiastic attachment from floor to platform. The Assembly itself struck the key note. But unfaillingly, the whole instrument breathed in harmony through its thousand strings, and without one discordant note this sweet unison of hallowed sympathies continued to the close.

In the many tumults which from time to time disturbed and disfigured the Queen's own,' the call was either for the civil power, or the military.

And, of a piece with this, through all their debates the appeal was to the statutes. We are not sure if a text was ever quoted, during their ten days' weary labour. At least, when it was seriously recommended, that there should 'be fewer speeches and more praying,' the advice was smothered in so general a laugh, that even the leader of the forty\*, who certainly must rank rather with the witty than the devout, expressed his hope, that so unparliamentary an occurrence might not go forth to the world.

On the other hand, we never heard an Act of Parliament quoted in the Free Assembly. Every argument was a text of Holy Writ. Every appeal was to the spiritual tastes of the renewed soul. And an atmosphere of prayer hung over the vast multitude, like the cloud of God of old. At once you felt, that here God reigns in undivided supremacy, for his word is paramount; here too he is realized, for they delight to approach his throne. The Bible was elevated to its high seat of dominion, and as much was done for asserting its power over all, as even at the Reformation itself. Freedom too, it might be seen, was not a thing which the brethren would take to themselves, yet withhold from others. But the maxim of all was, 'Let every man be persuaded in his own mind,' and they applied it, in its fullest tenderness and extent. There was a spirit even of self-renouncing love and generous equalization, we could observe, 'for no one esteemed himself better than another.' Above all, Jesus was recognized as in the midst—the Master whom the Assembly sought to honour—the Shepherd whose steps they would at every hazard follow—the Saviour at whose feet they laid their all. And even a godless world must have been compelled to reflect, that surely there does belong a glorious loveliness, as well as an unquestionable reality, to Him before whom they are not merely told, the crowns of heaven are cast, but whom their own eyes see thousands worshipping with all their treasures!

It was said of the State Assembly that it was very needless in them to issue their ordinance of exclusive communion, as no Church on earth, save it be the Synod of Munster, would court their embrace, or tolerate their alliance. Now, whether this be true or not, true it is that they have been favoured with no voice of fraternizing admiration, of affectionate cordiality, to cheer them on their rugged path, from any Church. Bask they do in the beams of royal favour, vehement as the dog-star, and, when corruption is going on, not less pestilential. But no mild ray of sister planet, shining in the same hemisphere, falls gently through their storm-rent clouds, and speaks of fellowship and prayer. Quite the reverse elsewhere! For on the broad platform of the Free Church, may be seen representatives of all denominations in our own land, and deputies from Ireland, Prussia, and America; and letters all redolent of charity, from Holland, where our fathers of old found refuge and hospitality, grace and learning, in days of trouble. In itself such approval and counsel was very pleasant; but as the vice by which Christ speaks to his churches, sweeter still. We hail it, as

\* The Rev. W. Proudfoot of Avondale — To these brethren, who, like Demas, have forsaken us, we would earnestly commend the following quotation from holy Baxter,—"It is the great astonishment of sober men, and not the least reproach that ever was cast upon our holy profession, to think with what a zeal for the work of Christ, some men seemed to be animated at the beginning of our disagreements, and how deeply they did engage themselves to him in solemn vows, protestations, and covenants. And now what advantages carnal self hath since got, and turned the stream another way! So that the same men have since been the instruments of our calamity, in breaking in pieces and dishonouring the Churches of Christ, yea, and gone so near to the taking down, as much as in them lay, the whole ministry that stand approved in the land. O! do not by trifling give advantage to the temper to destroy your work, and you together."

the assurance that we have not 'followed a light that leads astray,' nor missed the footsteps of the flock.

And who after this will talk of schism? Is that schism which unites together all Christ's servants in the bonds of peace, and separates them from an unclean and unblest residuum—an expiring carcase of skin and skeleton? Could that be schism over which all who love the Lord Jesus have clapped their joyful hands, and which all true churches have thanked God that they have beheld it? No. It is easy to brand a church with the death's-head and cross-bones of schism; but not so easily established, save in the ear of prejudice or credulity. Schism is the antagonist of unity—and we are sure to err in regard to schism, unless we first understand what unity implies. There is a unity in some bodies, which looks fair, and lasts awhile. But it is a unity of interest,—or a unity of fear,—or a unity of etiquette,—or a unity of compulsion,—or a unity of habit. But a unity such as this, is hollow, rotten, worthless; it is the unity of a gathered sheaf—snap the frail band, and all is a loose and scattered heap. It is impure too. It does not cement, nor weld,—neither does it sanctify. And consequently it can be no source of prosperity to any church. There is, however, a unity founded on Christ, and identical with that unity which subsists between the Father and the Son,—a unity in faith and hope—a unity in aim and desire—a unity of affectionate love and unbounded confidence. And unity like this is what the Saviour enjoins. Any unity, however, but such unity, is no required—no accepted unity. It is the unity of free-masons—not the unity of believers. And, however men may speak, there is schism in the body where this unity prevails. To separate from an outward church, is called schism. And it *may* be so. But not necessarily. Necessarily, however, there is a schism in a church, if one member be there who cannot join with me as a believer. But the schism is his, not mine. It is *not* I who rend the church, but he. We are called to unity, and warned against schism. But the unity to which we are called, is such a unity as subsisted between Christ and his Father. And the schism therefore, against which I am admonished, is not a schism that separates me from a fellow-creature, but such a schism as would break up my unity with God in Christ, 'That they may be one, *even as we are one.*'

Next to having a clean conscience, and free hands, the great thing is a single eye—not in the sense of uprightness, but merely in the sense of purpose. It is well to be pure in the sight of all men, and without restraint. But, over and above, we must have a mark and end—a course and a goal, if we are not sadly to fail in any enterprise. Wherever there is vacillation in design, there we are sure to find helplessness,—'a double-minded man is unstable in all his ways.' But it is power itself, if not conquest, to have a clear apprehension of my own meaning—a vivid idea of what I would be at. Even mistaken zeal, and a paltry aim, and great reverses, if we are only aware of what we are doing, and would do, will be a tower of strength. It will impart spirit to our actions, and invest our history with grandeur. Now, the Free Church had this advantage assuredly. Their eye was single,—and so it was full of light; their will was single,—and so it was instinct with vigour. They were embarked on an ocean wide at least. But they kept a heaven in sight. To christianize their own neglected land, and a heathen world—to be a Missionary Church,—to develope and unfold all the marvellous energies of Presbyterianism, for the gathering of the elect by the preaching of the word, this was their high aim, ruling, yet guiding all their impulses,—this was their cynosure, and by it they steered their perilous way,—this was the centre round which every speaker revolved,—to which every scheme gravitated,—which gave precision to all our efforts, and resistless strength even to an infant church.

The Church of Scotland has been the subject of lavish eulogy, and our opponents were always most anxious to extol her constitution, when they aimed at a deadlier violation of its principles and freedom. But for a century past, and more, what have all the land-marks of our original polity been,—all the monuments of our fathers' zeal, save like the magnificence of Sidon, a ruin under water,—discerned only at some favourable tide, or by some adventurous traveller? Oftentimes have we seen what was once a full and hearty current, seized by the cold of winter, pursuing its slow and hard-earned way beneath a sheet of massive ice, that seemed ever on the point of sealing it up in eternal fetters. And just so was it with the spirit of our Scottish Reformers, during the reign of Moderation,—that bleak winter of religion in our land. The stream of life was not, it is true, overpowered, and driven wholly away; but it was a hidden and languid stream. At every step it dragged its chain, and seemed as if about to cease from flowing. It held on its way. But that was all,—it shed no fruitfulness along its course. Not one principle of our Church did the Moderate leaders understand. Not one of its capabilities did they work out, during their ascendancy. Not one department of its constitution did they execute according to the mind and practice of our fathers. Indeed, where freedom—unrestricted and unsuspecting freedom—is not known, Presbyterianism must expire.

But, no sooner had freedom braced the air anew, than Presbyterianism is established in its fulness and vigour. The Free Church boldly threw itself into the mind of the Reformers, and to recast all things in their lofty mould, was its avowed design. Nor was the effort too much for its infant strength. It has set up our primitive polity in all its extent,—it has administered all its principles,—it has reproduced all its characteristics. As our fathers, with regard to the grievance of patronage, which they could only 'crave to have reformed,' but could not themselves reform, so, in regard to the principle of an Establishment, the Free Church could only assert, but had it not in their power to accomplish it. This, however, they did, scared not by all that had happened,—they inserted it on the very front of their testimony. Dr. Urwick, in his 'Thoughts suggested by the late ecclesiastical movement,' and various others among our dissenting friends, cannot wonder enough at the tenacity with which we cling to a system that has wrought our overthrow. But our astonishment is all the other way; for whilst from the beginning we have held strenuously by the principle of an Establishment, late events have only served to show us its value and bearing in a more impressive light? Coming to the root, the *principle* of Establishments is this, that every man is bound to promote the interests of Christianity with all his means. This, however, is not a *principle* that applies to a government exclusively,—though its scope must embrace political influence and authority, of course, and *a fortiori*,—the *principle* reaches to every holder of land and capital; and unless, therefore, the *principle* of an Establishment be conceded, it cannot be unfair in such individuals to deny us the facilities we ask for propagating the 'truth as it is in Jesus.' Why is it that the Free Church of Scotland looks our aristocracy so boldly in the face, and tells them at their peril, to refuse Christ's people opportunity of serving Him as they desire? Even, because we hold the grand principle of an Establishment,—the principle that lays every one, without exception, under a necessity from which he cannot escape, to glorify God by the diffusion of the truth.\*

---

\* Dr. Wardlaw is the last man who should attack the spiritual independence of Established Churches, and mingle so much of condescension and pity in his eye when he smiles upon us. On what tenure does he hold his own place of worship? Has he not

At the same time, let not the votaries of the existing Establishment boast over us, as if we were in a dilemma of inconsistency, because we deny the principle of Voluntaryism, whilst still we occupy its position. For the question of an Establishment as a practical measure is directly the question of the State,—and the question of the Church but remotely and subordinately. The Church of Christ is bound to enter into alliance with the State, provided she can still remain the Church of Christ in doing so: And, she also is bound to make proclamation unto the State, of its duty in this respect. But further, the Church has neither call—nor right,—nor power to proceed. All beyond this point is the concernment and obligation of the State alone.

Having laid at its foundation the true principle of Christian freedom, as well as the true standard of Christian obligation, in the principle of an Establishment, the Free Church went boldly forward to set in motion all her organization, as a Church of Christ standing on the platform of Presbytery.\* So far as her power reached during the limited period of one Assembly, she made good all her promises,—and gave effect to most of those protests which had so long been accumulating on the table of her General Assembly. Non-intrusion is thoroughly secured. But this was not enough,—popular election is recognized in all its Scriptural extent. The Eldership is permanently placed on a right basis, and the ancient order of Deacons restored as an essential part of our economy. The cause of Education was duly attended to, as in the times of Knox, and an impulse given not merely to the erection of schools, but of a theological college,—and a university upon a Christian basis. And, as at once connected with the heathen by the tie of duty, and with the faithful everywhere by affection, the Free Church, like her ancestors of old, joyfully held out the right hand of fellowship to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and placed missions on a footing more catholic and efficient than ever.

Thus equipped, and on her course, our Church occupies high vantage ground indeed; and without compromise may she now hold intercourse with all, and speak the truth to all without offence. Especially, we would remark, she is now pretty much independent of all extrinsic countenance, and superior to all political manoeuvre. We would not boast—but it is a pure matter for congratulation, that now are we done with a hostile but wily Government—and done for ever. The day of perfidious Bills,\* and

---

title-deeds? Do not these documents engross the *creed* of his Church? Is not that creed, by the terms of his charter, the ground of his lease? Let him take one article out of his creed,—and could he possess his church another Sabbath? No. Is it not clear then, that unless virtually the *principle* of an Establishment is felt, Dr. Wardlaw has no more spiritual independence than we ever had,—and far less than what we at this moment enjoy. Only let his superior act toward him as patrons have done to us, and be able at the same time to command the Court of Session, and he will then admit, that there will be true liberty for the Church of Christ, only when the *principle* of an Establishment,—or the obligation of all, to help forward the cause of righteousness by every means within their power, has become universally ascendant.

\* Lord Aberdeen has tabled his Bill once more—and it is even worse than when it first issued from the Dean's pen. It substantiates every prediction, and justifies every proceeding of the Secessionists. We have no intention of analyzing it: but we cannot help adverting to one feature of it which is new, viz., the substitution of 'parishioners' for communicants, as the individuals to whose judgment the qualities of a minister are to be submitted. No doubt it was of some use to introduce a clause that will allow Episcopalian heritors some influence in the choice of a pastor who may be a gentleman. But the man who could place on the same level as to ecclesiastical privilege, and the exercise of a scriptural duty, infidels and Papists, and members of the Church, shows that he cares for no rule of God's word, but aims only at conciliating a majority in his favour. Manifestly the haughty peer is himself 'lawyer-rid,' and for fear of a third castigation

humiliating deputations is over, and it is not likely that we shall soon again see the Church of Christ bandied—(as of old Christ himself was betwixt Caiaphas and Pilate, and Herod,)—between insolent State-secretaries, and pedantic Barons, implacable judges, and cold-blooded divines. The *liberum arbitrium* is ours at last. We are free in the liberty that Christ has given us. It will be a very different matter, therefore, to negotiate with us now, from what it would have been but six weeks ago. We are in circumstances that will enable us to say to any who may take a fancy to another series of proposals—'Let there be no ambiguity, and no delay—here is a Church formed after the model of Christ, so far as we have been taught it; you may endow it if you choose—but you must endow it as it stands.'

It was an error, and a serious one, which was committed at the Reformation, both in Germany and Geneva, that they suffered the tide on the neck of which they had been borne so far, to fall before they completed their projected schemes; and in this way lost advantages which it was ever afterwards (especially in the case of Lutheranism, which stands to this day a fragment, vast but imperfect) found impossible to overtake. We would warn the Free Church against this danger, and implore it to be on its guard. Many will urge, Now we have done a great deal, let us breathe awhile: enthusiasm is good as an impulse, but dangerous as a current, let us wait till it subsides: it will not do always to keep the same pace, else many will fall behind,—let us draw the rein. But such ideas will work injury if they prevail. The cloud of influence that has brought us of late such refreshing from the presence of the Lord, will not fix itself above us, and loiter on its way to other regions till we have filled and emptied our vessels at leisure. Even by October next, we may not find the general mind so susceptible of impression as in May; and unless, therefore, the die of our primitive constitution be vigorously struck now, we will shortly find that we must labour with the chisel, where at present the mould would be sufficient—or what will be worse, we may learn, when it is too late, that it is impossible to carry our arrangements farther, and that we shall have to desist before we have realised one half of what we had sketched.

But though we throw out the above hints, we do not apprehend any cessation of energy and exertion on the part of our Free Church, until it be thoroughly organized according to the pattern of our Reformers, in subordination to the will of Christ. And should it so turn out, then whether we regard this movement as a *system*, or as an *event*, it is not possible to exaggerate either its present or its prospective consequences. We need to restrain ourselves here. For no doubt the human mind, always fond of discoursing on the future, is much too quick and ardent in its speculations upon a new juncture of affairs; and the results that time elicits, are frequently not a little at variance with the results which we had calculated. We may not have been at all mistaken as to the force and current of an event. It may be capable of all that we predicated of it. But in a short while after it has begun to move, it enters among other forces and

---

from the law Lords, who certainly are not too civil to his Lordship, he has dared, in the face of the Church, to assign the same standing and authority to an atheist or drunkard, as to a communicant, in the trial of a minister. Yet Dr. Muir of St. Stephens especially approves of this part of the bill!! And it is of this bill that William Penney, Esquire, has with wanton hardihood ventured to say, 'The Bill gives all which was promised—gives all the Church as an Establishment could seek or expect—and all that is useful for a Church of Christ to possess.' Surely, my Lord, a sheriffdom, if not the bench, is the least reward you can offer in return for such 'An opinion.'



new currents, by which it is so shaped and turned, that its first character is wholly neutralized, and it starts into a path we never could have imagined. Still, however, in spite of all the caution that is proper for us to observe in such a matter, we are convinced, that the Free Church of Scotland is pregnant with great results, whether we view it simply as a church, or as a crisis—as a system, or as a movement—as a juncture, or as a society.

Viewed as a *system*, it will at present contrast with great vividness and advantage against Episcopacy, and demonstrate to thoughtful and candid minds, how inert and unprofitable for all the purposes of truth, is this elaborate framework. At all times has this model of ecclesiastical régime been found a weak, though showy engine—serving no great end either of usefulness or discipline—fit enough as the appanage of a monarchy—quite unable, even with the resources of Britain at its command, to mould either a world or a nation to the power of the faith. More, however, than even heretofore, does it seem to be paralysed for the high aims of a Christian Church, so that of late it has been seeking, through 'the Factory Education Bill,' to borrow the semblance of ecclesiastical life, by a beggarly accession to its political influence. In this the ambitious hierarchy has been worsted; and either will it now sink into deeper impotency, or call in superstition to its aid. But at this moment the Free Church of Scotland rises by her side, and now the eyes of Christendom are fixed on the wondrous spectacle of Presbyterianism, denied all State countenance and support, girding herself for war against evil to the ends of the earth; whilst Episcopacy, basking in the sunshine of royal favour, leagues herself with the very foes she ought to have slain, and becomes a tool of the prince of darkness. Independency, too, or more properly Congregationalism, will be now put anew on its trial, side by side with Presbytery. And most assuredly in all that regards vigour and compactness—in all that results from counsel, and depends on union—in all too that guards justice, and quickens love, it will be found as a system, essentially defective, when compared with the Free Church of Scotland.

We shall fall, however, into a mistake of no trivial character, should we imagine that, because our system is admirable, the reconstruction of it will avail to any change we set our hearts upon. On the contrary, even in the heart of the best system, something is often bound up which is inconsistent with God's mind; and so after all our labours, because this is the case, we may not find the success that was anticipated. The ground must be surveyed—the channels cut—the banks raised—the rails laid down. Yet let us not be disheartened if, after all, the traffic is inconsiderable. The best engineered line often pays worst. Man's calculations do not always suit with the sovereignty of God—and what we would do by means, he prefers doing himself. Even with our machinery, as perfect as may be, and owned too of God, it must be kept in mind, that it is not to evangelize the nation, in the sense of making all its families 'households of faith,' that we are called. Never was this done by any Church, however pure, and intrepid, and active; and less than ever have we reason to expect that the world shall embark on its millennium, through the instrumentality of Churches which the Lord saw needful to visit in his wrath, and which he has shaken to their foundations. We are to lift up the cross in all our villages. We are to speak of Christ to every man—running to and fro on errands of saving knowledge. But in all this labour we are not to suppose that it is given us to introduce the reign of peace, through righteousness. All unto which we seem appointed, is to gather in the elect who are waiting in the clefts of the rock, until the glory of God passes by, and summons them from nature's fearful pit.

And here we take leave to say that we think a time for this purpose will be given. The period may be short, and after it we do anticipate 'a great earthquake.' But previous to this, we shall have, it seems to us, a period of calm—a breathing-time of safety, as a day of keen and ceaseless labour. We never have concealed our belief that the future is big with surpassing trouble. Still it is not at variance with this apprehension, to hold also that there shall be an interval of repose, when, as betwixt the crucifixion of the Saviour and the siege of Titus, there shall be large opportunities for the preaching of the Gospel. And as such a view may tend materially to quicken our energies, as well as console, we shall for a moment touch upon the grounds that render it probable. It is true that the aristocracy have declared themselves hostile to us, and may hinder the introduction of the Gospel within the parishes of which they hold the superiority. But at the worst, this would only be an intimation from 'the Spirit,' that we must 'pass by Mysia, and come down to Troas,' because the harvest in the former case is not white, but in the other the fruit is ready to drop. We are however, convinced, that that kind of opposition which our landed proprietors have given us of late, will abate, and that they who have so uniformly shown their profound indifference to the religion of their tenants, will immediately resume their former habits. The very same spirit that has recently manifested itself against our Free Church, was provoked by the Secession in 1743—and lairds and heritors were just as virulent then as now.\* But 'the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof;' and they who were the mere tillers of the soil, until the great Owner comes, soon abated their proud spirit, and the word had free course; until from four ministers in the same connection in 1732, they now muster not fewer than 367, to whom the entire kingdom is free. Had we no other ground, therefore, than the experience of the first Seceders, to rest on, we could not but expect all latitude in the preaching of the truth, whatever hostile influences we may have to encounter at the outset. And it will be well for the country, that this hope is realized; for though a well-conditioned people may bear much, it is perilous to try them to the utmost verge of their forbearance.

But whether we read Scripture, or general history, we remark in addition, we find it almost uniformly true, that a season of violent effort, or of persecution, is followed by a time of rest, when all parties suffering from exhaustion, cease to annoy or menace one another. It was memorably so after the troubles occasioned by Paul to the faithful throughout Judea, had ceased; 'for then had the churches rest, and were edified, and were multiplied.' And scarcely ever has God's periods procedure been different—but at all periods he has caused a period of tranquility to succeed a time of conflict in his church. Indeed, 'except those days of tribulation were shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.' Chiefly, however, do we found that hope of a little breathing-time, which we have ventured to express, on a distinct revelation of Peter in this passage, 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth

\* "In certain instances, landlords threatened to turn their tenants out of their farms, if they permitted the Seceders to assemble for worship on their ground. The Earl of Belhaven having threatened to deprive a tenant of his lease, because he chose to attend a Secession place of worship, received the following dignified reply: 'My Lord, My grandfather, father, and myself have all been comfortable as tenants on your lordship's estate. But we never surrendered our consciences to you. And, if your lordship is resolved to be the first persecuter in East Lothian for conscience sake, I am determined to be the first in submitting to persecution.' " M'KERNOW, p. 142.

beneath : the sun shall be turned into darkness; and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come.' Now, most distinctly is it here promised, that, in the latter days, a great revival of godliness shall take place over all the earth, and the elect be abundantly gathered. This, however, we are of course entitled to assume shall be accomplished, in the ordinary use of means, so long as the present dispensation continues. But as to the date of this blessed era, Peter gives us two landmarks, in an antecedent period, and a succeeding event, which show us when the promise is to be realised in all its extent and plenitude. He *first* specifies the period during which it is to happen—'the latter days,'—and this *express* uniformly denotes the close of our dispensation. But Paul; still later speaks of 'the last days;' and posterior to both, John says, 'it is the last hour.' If then the times of the apostles were the 'last;' nay, if apostles had ceased to number time by days, because it was run down to hours, we must be far amid the evening twilight; we must be verging close on sunset; we cannot be very distant from the time of which Peter speaks. But we are *next* told, that the prediction quoted from Joel shall precede a strange event, 'even the great and notable day of the Lord.' This day is not come as yet. It comes, however, within the interval of 'the latter days;' and when it comes, it shall be clothed in all the majesty of God. It is the day of God, in opposition to the day of men, which has lasted since the fall. And then shall all the earth has of strength be shaken, its greatness laid in ruins, and Jesus exalted in universal and magnificent triumph over all his foes. But, manifestly, Joel's 'notable day,' and John's 'seventh vial,' are synchronous, if not identical. Nay, it must be so; for the seventh vial ends the judgments of the world; its blow is final; the voice from the throne declares the completeness of the plague; the mystery is finished; 'it is done.' If, however, with this view, we connect the fact, to which we have frequently made allusion before, that the last drops of the sixth vial must now be running, we shall understand how near we may be to the very period *when, with solemn judgments on the earth, there will be vouchsafed the noblest mercy the earth has yet enjoyed.* It is before 'the great and notable day' of 'the latter days' that the great effusion is to take place, and therefore even now 'the set time to favour us may be come.' At all events, let us feel near a signal manifestation of God, and multiply our efforts whilst the day lasts. In the end hostilities will be resumed. But we shall have a truce for a season, and the Spirit shall descend in heavenly fulness upon a languishing world.

Granting, however, that there shall be a time of peace, even though only for a little, then, as a *system*, the Free Church cannot fail to produce extensive results, and leave its impress on the whole breadth of society. It sets forth over the entire land with unrestricted freedom, and energetic zeal, and commanding talent, and, at the same time, elevated not more in its own consciousness, than in the eye of all, by the sacrifices it has made. And these are moral resources which would have secured the triumph almost of any cause. Subordinated, however, as they are to the advancement of the Gospel, they shall surely make our land at length resound with the tidings of a free salvation.

Considered as an *event*, the results of the Free Church are not less important than its results as a *system*. That by means of it all the principles in which it has originated, and all the truths of Presbyterianism, will be more firmly rooted, and more widely spread—that it will check the errors which are beginning to prevail in certain branches of the Presbyterian Church, and restore their soundness and energy as at the first, by the power of affectionate jealousy and open-hearted intercourse—that it will limit, if not counteract, as a development of moral influence and

moral character such as men were not prepared for in our day, the present tendency to arise the sensuous and visible over the spiritual and unseen—that it will announce in language that no man can mis-understand, and by symbols which all the world can calculate, the excellence of Jesus, and the value of his gospel—that it will set the heart of all Christians on a rally; above all, that it will direct the Church to Him who is alone her head, and teach her to long for the time when He shall reign in the midst of her, and be her glory, it is not difficult to admit. But, on the other hand, it cannot be concealed, that as an *event* the Free Church will lead to consequences of a far different nature from what we have now mentioned. For, as an event, it must go to separate still more widely the two orders of society, and by the mere fact of their now hostile, as well as different religions, even though there be no persecution, drive the rich and poor as far asunder as in Russia. As an event, it must shake our ecclesiastical Establishment to the dust, and thus ultimately involve in the same ruin all our other institutions; for by one stroke has the religion of Scotland been disestablished, and a majority has been put into the hands of dissent. As an event, not only will it henceforth compel our statesmen to manage this empire by the balance, instead of the union of conflicting parties; but the fact having taken hold of all minds, that the bidding of the State, and the bidding of Christ, are opposite and irreconcilable, it has placed Christians now in the same relation to the Civil Magistrate as in the days of Cæsar or of Nero. Above all, the movement we speak, of simply as an *event*, has led, is leading and more and more it will lead to the disentanglement of the Church from the world, until all intercourse between them ceases. The world, however, cannot remain without a religion; and when, therefore, it feels itself left naked, alike of the form and the fire of godliness, it will welcome, it will invite, it will purchase at any cost, the embrace of superstition. Popery then enters in and takes possession. We do not say that this will be a process of one step; neither can we determine the circuit which it will take. But in all likelihood the Erastian Establishment will speedily and cheerfully yield to extensive innovations in the direction of the Church of England. Mitigated Episcopacy in the Establishment will soon find it for its interest to league with the apostolic succession of our Non-jurors, and Laud no longer sheathe his horn and hoof. But Puseyism, wanton from success, and with the key in her hand, will lose no time in opening the door to Popery, and once more ‘the Mother of Harlots’ prepares her incantations in the heart of Scotland! Yet, beyond this point we can descry a further change. No hierarchy, be it Puseyite or Popish, will rear its mitred head, and surpliced form, and parade its mimic priesthood on the stage of our native land without instant revulsion—without dire revenge. We would not deal in hazardous predictions, nor scatter undefined alarms: But beyond all doubt, there are signs not equivocal of Antichrist’s approach. His lines of circumvallation are drawn; and we would not be astonished, if very suddenly we heard him blow his summons of capitulation and surrender. As certain, however, it is, to all who know either the past history of Scotland or its present mood, that if the Man of Sin shall seize our temples, and garrison our strongholds, he will awaken a terrific conflict,—a conflict at once with a nation’s history and a nation’s conscience, backed by a nation’s power!

When this struggle comes, it will be asked, who brought it on the land; and variously will the questioned be answered. That ‘the forty’ are to blame up to the full amount of their ability, let no man deny. Still, to lay any great burden of public agitation on the shoulder of so weak and futile

a faction, seems to us quite absurd. Neither would we, as Dr. McFarlan of Greenock did in the Assembly, charge the whole guilt upon the present administration for we are convinced, that what has happened, happened not through the design, but by the blunder of her Majesty's advisers; and glad would they be to recal their infatuated policy. The Moderate party were of course determined to regain their lost ascendancy, and to make this aim good, we believe there is nothing they would not have perilled or sacrificed. Yet neither had they the means of fulfilling all their wickedness. Puseyism, however, caressed by the aristocracy, and connived at by the throne,\* blended its influence against us, and arrayed the entire mind of the great and noble in opposition to our claims. But chief of all, in this grievous overthrow, were the men who brought to our controversy the vindictive feelings of worsted diplomacy and rancorous partisanship. Who these are, is a matter of history, and we have no need to conceal them. It was my Lord Aberdeen, and his ally the Lord Justice Clerk for Scotland, that from the outset were the mooters of this strife. They schemed, and managed the fatal drama. And without reserve or abatement, on them we devolve the entire responsibility of this catastrophe, with all the mischief it has wrought as yet, and all the mischiefs that must follow in its train.

But handing up this question to a higher tribunal, where God sits and not man, we turn for a moment to another not less important, What is now the duty of all who hitherto have ranked as members of the Church of Scotland? And assuredly this question, whatever it may have been formerly, is at last simple enough. It is not, Do you approve of the way in which the controversy has been managed? nor, Do you think that the secession was imperative? It is not even, Do you acquiesce in all our principles? nor, Would it be of any consequence that a bill was now introduced, which embraced our every claim? The question that each member of the Church of Scotland must now consider, lies not among these elements at all,—it is a question of much nearer access, and arrower compass. This is it. The Church of Scotland has become two,—it is divided into two religious bodies,—in a loose way of speaking, we have now two churches in the midst of us. Well, to one or other of these must all adhere; and the only question which each man has now to resolve, is, *Whether of the two shall I join?* There are two alternatives,—but two only. It is not possible to regard both parties as alike right, or as alike wrong. The events of the last month have made it clear as sunshine that *the State Church, and the Free Church of Scotland have not one thing in Common.* In the course of eight days, every principle asserted—every measure adopted—every statute passed—every case decided—every sentence affirmed during a period of eight years by the latter was without exception, and without a pause, swept away by the former, not merely in indecent haste, but with a desperation that seemed allied to phrenzy. The two bodies, then, are not simply mistaken RIVALS; they are irreconcilable ANTAGONISTS. They do not touch, save it may be for conflict, at a single point. They have not one common feature—or motive—or design—or sympathy. They differ not—as we do with Dissenters—on minor points; they are essentially, intensely, immutably opposed. Ignorant or

---

\* "Her Majesty will continue to maintain inviolate the Presbyterian Church government in Scotland. You do not require this assurance through me, especially when you had so lately the pleasure of seeing her Majesty amongst yourselves." So spake the Lord High Commissioner to the Residuary. And there was no voice honest and intrepid enough to remind him, that so far from recognising the Church of Scotland, when amongst us, her Majesty was advised openly to insult it, by declaring that it was a Church with which she could not worship.

affected men may choose to liken the present rupture to the hasty contention betwixt Paul and Barnabas. But it is a separation far different in all respects;—the separation not of infirmity, but of principle,—a separation of godliness, not of temper—the separation even of light from darkness,—of Christ from Belial, because there is no concord between them.

The question then to be decided, is abundantly simple—it is this, and no more, Which of these two ecclesiastical bodies shall I belong to—with which shall I cast in my lot at present and with which would a desire to be found associated at last? And can any one, whose eyes the Lord hath opened, halt even for a moment? *Here* is a church free in the amplest liberty of Christ—and *there* is a church which, with its own hands has wreathed on its neck, the yoke of Erastian domination. *Here* is a church that is lailed by all godly communions, and which in return embraces them with a kiss of holy love—and *there* is a church which not a single body of Christians acknowledges, and which actually has flung them from its bosom. *Here* is a church, to which for the most part, all who are known for their spiritual character have attached themselves—and *there* is a church made up almost entirely of men not known among the saints. *Here* is a church, finally, whose principles and objects, if carried out, and prospered, would make the wilderness to blossom—and *there* is a church, which no Christ-loving soul can wish to spread, and whose increase would be the triumph of darkness throughout the land.

Let no Christian member of the Church of Scotland, then, hesitate to join the Free Church. It is his duty, simple and imperative—and therein he will be blessed. In doing so we walk in the steps of all our martyrs—and we shall be honoured to lift up an impressive testimony for Jesus, in a world that sets him at nought. And in all likelihood we shall scape, as Dr. Cunningham powerfully remarked, the judgments that will soon overtake the wicked in their place. And at length shall we be accounted worthy to stand before the Son of Man. Let no one imagine that a protest such as our fathers lifted up against Moderation, is now available. No. It would be distinct rebellion. It is not rebellion but a lawful exercise of right, to protest against a vicious *administration* of a sound *system*, and to remain within it. The system is mine, for I have espoused it—not its abuse by evil hands, which I repudiate. But if the administration I reclaimed against, shall any how become the system, then my position is wholly altered. Remaining as I was, I adopt the new constitution however repugnant to me; and to protest against it therefore does not save my conscience, but proclaims me a mutineer. I have a right, on joining the Church of England, to challenge Puseyism, for that belongs not to the constitution,—but I have no right to protest against Episcopacy, which I have already homologated in the fact of my membership. In like manner, I was quite entitled to lift up my voice against Erastianism in the Church of Scotland hitherto. But now that the Church has become Erastian by law and constitution, Erastianism is part and parcel of the system,—it is term of her Establishment; and if I protest against this principle, or any doings in accordance with it, I protest against what I have sanctioned, and this is more than an absurdity,—it is revolt against the State, whose institution I will neither quit nor submit to. Every protest, therefore, against Erastian Moderation in the State Church of Scotland now, is an unequivocal act of rebellion.

We dismiss that great movement on which we have been commenting, with the remark, That it would be well that they who will not look on the event in the light of prophecy, would at least look on prophecy in the light of this event. What is the juncture now reached? What are the questions which wait to be solved? The aim of the world,—what is it?

Even to seize the reins of government in the Church,—and it has seized them. Christ's enemies have possessed themselves of his sceptre, and sat down upon his throne. It is not evident, therefore, that something more impressive than a testimony,—more subduing than a crisis,—more palpable than a Church, is needed to redress the great wrong that has been offered to our Prince, and array Him with his rightful sovereignty? Let him appear, and his enemies will cast down their spoil, and he shall wear a brighter crown than ever. But no arm save his own, and that arm laid bare in the midst of us, will restore what has been taken away. And the attitude of the CHURCH—what is it? It breathes and pants for union, and rest in union. Blest spirit! noble aim! seraphic ambition! But where shall we find a union—centre—a rallying point? Earth could not furnish it, though we were to ransack all her fulness. Churches may love one another, and so they do. But no church will say to a sister church, be thou our nucleus, and take precedence us all. What though we talk of union then,—it indicates concord,—it may lead to co-operation; but to union,—essential and identifying union,—union without pressure, restraint, or jealousy,—union, such as heaven is the scene of, we never shall approach, until He come who shall be at once the centre of all his saints, and the object of their ceaseless worship. 'Thou therefore, that sittest in light and glory unapproachable, Parent of angels and men, look upon this thy poor, and almost spent and expiring Church. Leave her not a prey to the importunate wolves that wait, and think long till they devour thy tender flock,—the wild boars that have broke into thy vineyard, and left the print of their polluting hoofs on the souls of thy servant. O, let them not bring about their damned designs, that now stand at the entrance of the bottomless pit, expecting the watchword to open, and let out those dreadful locusts, to reinvolve us in that pitchy cloud of darkness, where we never more shall see the sun of thy truth again,—never hope for the cheerful dawn,—never more hear the bird of morning sing! Hitherto thou hast but freed us, and that not fully, from the unjust and tyrannous claim of thy foes. Now unite us entirely, and appropriate us to thyself,—tie us everlastingly in willing homage to the prerogative of thy eternal throne! O! perfect and accomplish thy glorious acts,—for men may leave their works unfinished; but thou art God, and thy nature is perfection. Shouldst thou bring us thus far onward from Egypt, to destroy us in this wilderness, though we deserve, yet, thy great name would suffer in the rejoicing of thine enemies, and the deluded hope of all thy servants. But when thou hast settled peace in the Church, then shall all thy saints address their voice of joy and triumph to thee, standing on the shore of that Red Sea into which our enemies had almost driven us! Thy kingdom is near at hand,—thou art standing at thy door. Come forth out of thy royal chambers. O Prince of all kings of the earth,—put on the visible robes of thy imperial majesty,—take up that unlimited sceptre which thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed thee. The voice of thy bride now calls thee. All creatures sigh to be renewed!'

\*.\* [Without pledging ourselves to all the sentiments expressed in it, we have given at full length this able article (from the *Presbyterian Review* of July last)—as rendering complete the plan of our First Volume.—ED. F. C. M.]

## III.—AN ESTIMATE OF THE SECESSION IN SCOTLAND.

We have been struck in reading some of the speeches in Parliament, and some passages in the newspapers, with the singular opinions which have been formed by men, (of whom greater accuracy might be expected,) respecting the extent of the late Scottish Secession. The number of Seceding clergymen, we are told, is “not Five Hundred;” “the number of *parish* ministers is *only* 270,” and then we are referred to the Lay Association for the Kirk, and the sudden missionary-feelings of its Episcopal Lords, Baronets, and Lairds, as showing much zeal for the Residuary Establishment. In this way an impression may be conveyed to some, that the Secession, after all, was unimportant.

Let us then look at the simple state of the facts, and then suppose an analogous case in England, and consider what we should think of *that*.

We have in Scotland these circumstances: the whole number of parish and of *quoad sacra* churches was something under 1,200; of these the most important, were, the parish churches in cities and large towns, and the *quoad sacra* churches. The importance of the former arose from the fact, that they generally were held by the most eminent ministers, and, being situated in populous places, provided a great amount of Church accommodation. The importance of the *quoad sacra* churches arose from this: that they also were built in populous places. While many parish churches could be found in the country parts, in which (partly from the growth of dissent, especially in the Southern counties, and partly from the paucity of the population,) very few persons ever attended, and two hundred would be considered a large congregation; the city and *quoad sacra* churches were generally adapted to large numbers. Those who have been recently in Scotland would not find it difficult to name many city and *quoad sacra* churches, in which the average attendance of persons, was from 1,200 to 1,500 or upwards. Now the Free Church Secession comprized for the most part, town and the *quoad sacra* ministers; that is to say, by far the greatest number and nearly all the most numerously attended of the ministers, in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Greenock, Paisley, Perth, &c. And though we have no data on which to form a very precise calculation, yet we may, we believe, safely say, that the 467 ministers who seceded, were the ministers of at least twice as many individuals, as were included in the congregations of all the ministers who still adhered to the establishment. To the number of people who seceded from the congregations of these Seceding Ministers, must be added those who seceded from the congregations of others who adhered; and how general the feeling in favor of the Free Church is, may be gathered from this, that though only 270 *parish* ministers seceded, yet there are associations in support of the Free Church in 825 parishes.



Another fact to be considered, is the character of those who seceded :—namely Sir David Brewster the eminent Principal of St. Andrews ; five professors of the Aberdeen University ; Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Welsh from Edinburgh University ; from the Glasgow University ; and among the other eminent ministers, Dr. Forbes, Dr. Gordon, Dr. McFarlane, Dr. Keith, Dr. Duncan and others whose names are “familiar as household words.” Among the laity, Dr. Abercrombie ; we believe Lord Moncrieff ; the Marquis of Breadalbane, the principal *Presbyterian* Landlord in the country ; Marquis of Lorne, Sir Patrick Maxwell, and the Lord Provost of Edinburgh ; besides some members of Parliament and very nearly *all* the gentry who have been distinguished of late years, as supporters of the Church’s missions, Church extension, and other benevolent schemes. Let us enumerate some to remind our readers : Mr. Bruce of Kennett ; Mr. Nairne of Dunsinnane ; Mr. Buchan of Kelloe ; General Munro of Teaninch ; Mr. Christie of Durie ; Mr. J. M. Hog of Newliston ; Mr. Alexander of Ballochmyle ; Colonel Dundas of Carronhall ; Mr. A. Dunlop, Mr. A. E. Monteith, Mr. Speirs, and others among the Advocates,—Mr. M. M. Crichton of Rankeillor ; Mr. Campbell of Dunoon and Tullichewan ; General McDowal ; Mr. Campbell of Monzie ; Mr. H. Paul ; Mr. Thomson of Banchory ; Mr. Dunlop of Craigton ; Mr. Smith of Jordanhill ; and among the contributors and supporters to the Free Church (though some of these may not have joined the secession), we find also the names of Mr. Ewing of Levenside, Lady Colquhoun, Sir Andrew Agnew, Mr. Cadell of Trauant, Sir H. Seton of Pitmedden, the Duke of Argyle, Mr. Hastie M. P., Mr. P. M. Stewart, M. P., the Right Hon’ble F. Maule, the Hon. Mrs. Stewart Mackenzie, the Earl of Fife, the Hon. Arthur Kinnaid, Mr. Forbes of Culloden, Mr. Burnett of Monboddo, and very many more persons of property and station. And in the course of six months, what has been done ? Five hundred churches have been commenced, many of which are completed ; and seven hundred congregations have been formed. Besides this, all the *Missionaries* of the Church have joined the Free Church, together with a large body of probationers, divinity students, and parish schoolmasters.—We have enumerated these facts in order to lay the foundation for our analogy.

Let us now suppose a *SIMILAR* Disruption in the English Church. We must carefully observe the proportion between the populations of the two countries. To make *such* a secession, it would be necessary, that out of the whole body of ministers with congregations in England, (that is to say about thirteen thousand persons), *five thousand* should secede ; that with these should go a large body of curates ; that in addition to the five thousand ministers and the bodies of seceders from the respective congregations of these ministers, about 3,000 more seceding congregations should be formed from the residuary congregations ; that the seceding clergy should comprize not merely the Scholfields, Turtens, McBrides and other Evangelical professors or principals in the Universities, but also nearly every minister of eminence for evangelical piety and for ability,—the Bickersteths,

McNeiles, Stowells, Goodes, Bridgeses, Caruses, Noels, Dealtrys, Closes, Hoares, Brandrams, Pratts, &c. &c.—that it should consist principally of the ministers, not of little parishes, but of populous parish and district churches; that it should include *all* the missionaries of the Church Missionary and Jew's Societies; that it should include nearly all the honored men who have been distinguished for devoting their time and property to the good of mankind,—the Lords Cholmondeley, Bexley, Ashley, Roden, &c., the Plumpres, Kembles and other good men in parliament, and a very large proportion of the Episcopalian laudlords in the country; and that it should receive the sanction (by the free granting of land or the gift of money), of a very considerable additional body of influential persons. To make the similarity complete it would be further necessary, that instead of expending in the first twelve months \$350,000 on the erection of seven hundred churches; more than £3,500,000 should be spent in the erection of more than seven thousand; and finally that this immense secession, comprizing a very great proportion of the people of the land, should be added to a body of Dissenters, equal, (as the Dissenters in Scotland before the Secession were,) to a third of the whole population.

Let such a secession as this take place; and, (to keep up the proportions) let the number of adherents to it be not less in number than five millions of people, out of England's thirteen millions; let the total number of Dissenters thus be raised to nearly ten millions; let the remainder consist to a very considerable extent, of Roman Catholics, Infidels, and Puseyites, and men of no thought about religion:—and then will England understand (but not till then,) the full extent of the Scottish Secession.

Have we overcharged this comparison of things as they are in Scotland, with things as they might be in England? Not, we believe, *in a single particular*. We repeat that the Secession of the Free Church in Scotland, if the proportions of the clergy and of the populations in the two countries are regarded, is equal to a secession in England of five thousand ministers with a large body of curates, five millions of people, and a very great proportion of the wealth and intelligence of the country.

It may be thought by some that a more just comparison might be made between the Residuary Church of Scotland, and the Episcopalian Church in Ireland; that Church, which includes only about a tenth of the people, and has several parishes without a single Protestant communicant. But we apprehend, that if the Residuary Church and the Episcopal Church of Ireland were compared, there would be found very little in which they really agreed. They are both, it is true, Churches of small minorities; they are both Churches "minus the people;" but then it must be observed that the Irish Church was planted as the Church of the minority; that it was originally designed as a Missionary Church; that it NEVER HAD (as the Scottish Establishment long had) the affections or the adherence of the people—that it never, perhaps, was stronger, and certainly never more active than now;

that, moreover, the Irish Church, though it is the Church of the minority, is the Church of the wealthiest and most intelligent part of the population. Perhaps nineteenth-twentieths of the land in Ireland is the property of the Episcopalians ; they are the principal noblemen, gentry, members of professions, and traders of commercial industry. Can any thing of the kind be said in Scotland, of the Residuary Church ? Far from it, nineteen twentieths of the land in Scotland is in the hands of Episcopalians ; the nobility and landed gentry are for the most part Episcopalians ; and as to those landed proprietors or men of property, who are Presbyterians, we have already shown that *they* are principally Free Churchmen. We much doubt if it would be easy to name a large number of great proprietors, who are members of the Residuary Church, and if the Church of Ireland have on its side not only the property but the intelligence of the country, that is not the case with the Scottish Establishment. *Opposed* to her, are the names of Sir David Brewster, Drs. Abercrombie, Keith, Chalmers and others of distinguished fame ; among other Dissenters are Wardlaw, and Dick, and McCrie, and Douglas of Cavers ; among Episcopalians are Jardine, Wilson, Forbes and Alison ; and who is there we may ask, to be ranged on the other side ? Where are the eminent authors of whom the Residuaries can boast ? Where is a shadow of a support for a claim of superior intelligence ?

But, once more ; the Irish Establishment was secured by the Act of Union : Such as it is now, it was when its property and its existence were so secured ; if changed at all it is in the improved character of its ministers. But is the Scottish Residuary Establishment one and the same with that establishment, (*then* the Church nearly of nearly the whole nation) the security of which was guaranteed by the Scottish Union ? Is the Erastianized Residuary Church, one and the same thing with the Kirk of Scotland for which Rutherford and Renwick suffered ; and which underwent so many tribulations because it would not surrender the sacred doctrine, that the Lord Jesus Christ, and not the Civil Magistrate, is the rightful Head of His own Church ? Surely it is a new, another, an altered thing. There is no similarity between that Residuary Establishment and the ancient Kirk of our fathers. Well then, if, hereafter, there be demands made on the Legislature for the uprooting of this establishment ; if, hereafter, the people of Scotland for whose supposed benefit the security of their Kirk was guaranteed by the act of Union, come to the Parliament, and demand that that thing, which assumes the name of the Church of Scotland, be no longer supported by public funds for the benefit of that small body of people, who for form's sake, or from the force of prejudice, or under compulsion, adhere to her—let us hear nothing of national faith being involved in the matter. The treaty of Union was expressly, (and by all men confessedly), violated by the Statute of Queen Anne restoring Patronage. When the present parliament refused to repeal that Statute, it confirmed that violation. Many of the people of Scotland had already seceded ; the mass of those who remained have lately followed ; the contract with all has been broken, and

is at an end. But there are those who can strain at a gnat, though they swallow a camel. It is nothing to *them* that the Treaty of Union is violated by enforcing lay patronage in Scotland ; but when the people have left the Church, and a small monopolizing body of Residuaries only, remain in the establishment, and when it is found convenient to support these men, then, with what virtuous indignation is any infraction of the Treaty of Union denounced !

But what is the tendency of things ? Is it not to the testing of the question, whether, in fact, by any pretence of securities afforded by the Union, or by any other sophistry, the present establishment can long be maintained as an incubus on Scotland. A poor law is wanted, funds are required. Shall there be a new tax ? Shall the teinds go to pay the residuary ministers—the ministers minus a people ? We shall see how long.

Oh, it is said, this is all very true ; the Secession is very large ; it includes many people and great and good leaders ; but *it will not last*. Not last ? why not ? Will Moderatism last ? See who are the leaders of the Residuary Church ; mostly old men, men of an old school, the remains of a former generation. They will soon pass away. Who is to succeed them ? It is a singular fact that among the younger clergy of the Church, the men of influence with the present generation, and all the men who combine superior piety and superior ability,—are almost to a man Free Churchmen. Where among the moderates is a generation of rising and promising men ? In the Free Church Chalmers and Gordon may pass away (may the Lord long preserve them !) but the energies of Candlish, Cunningham, Buchanan, Lorimer, Moncrieff, Bonar, Hamilton, Begg, Guthrie, Paterson, Bruce, Lord Breadalbane, Mr. Maule (soon to be one of the wealthiest peers in Scotland), Campbell of Monzie, and it may be Lord Lorne, &c. are in their prime, or in their youth. How stands the case among the “Moderate” laity ? We need not say to any Scotsman, that the greater part of the adherents to the Residuary Church, are like its leaders, remnants of former days. It is among those who recollect the preaching, or are under the indirect and decaying influence of Robertson and Blair, that moderatism is now chiefly to be found. The young, and those who have grown up since Chalmers’ influence began to tell upon the country, these, principally, are the Seceders ; not indeed but that there are many of venerable age, by whom the Seceders have been joined, and from whom they have received the sanction of experience, and the applause of ripened judgments.

Yes, but then, “the landlords will put down the Secession.” Nay, nay ; to the landlords who have refused sites and who have persecuted their Seceding tenantry, the Free Church is, if possible, under greater obligation than to those who have assisted her. Their proceedings have awakened the national spirit ; they have driven by the force of sympathy to the aid of the Seceders all who abhor oppression ; they have bound men together in harmony and union ; they have given energy to the voice of prayer, and opportunity for the exhibition of patience. They did it in ignorance ; they did good unwillingly, but they did it

still, in fact. They have failed too, even in their immediate purposes. Despite the site-refusing system, 500 churches are now rearing their heads ; and we see that Dr. Chalmers has stated his expectation that ere three years are passed, 800 will be built. That is a *beginning* ;—800 churches plus the people ;—and that is besides the 500 dissenting congregations that existed before the late Secession, most of which were numerous, and some of which were and are exceedingly so.

Our course is now patiently and hopefully to wait. The last five years have done great things in Scotland ; let us wait quietly for the issue of five years more. Let us see *then*, if we be spared so long, what is the result of the double cause—the still decreasing popularity of the Residuary Church on the one hand, and the increasing popularity with the more perfect organization of the Free Church on the other hand. Let us see what is the effect of some more intrusions. It appears that at least two are proceeding, namely in Banff and in Thurso, notwithstanding Lord Aberdeen's Act ;—in the latter case the objection that the presentee could not speak Gaelic, which one would think a fair and important one, being overruled. It was said in Parliament that that Act was passed to satisfy 150 adhering ministers who required some security against intrusions ; at any rate “the Forty” who remain in the Church, are pledged Non-Intrusionists. How long will *they* remain in the establishment ? Have ministerial Secessions then, ended ? Ended ! only the boldest have yet come out. Ere long the rest who are at all true-hearted, will follow. It is clear from Sir George Sinclair's letter that *he* for one, is uncomfortable ; and is he not, and has he not been, a type of a class ?

And what is to be the effect of the Free Church movement in England ? Are patrons to present Puseyites to parishes, and are Bishops who protest against Puseyism, to induct them ; and still is the example of Scotland to be overlooked ? Has it not affected some minds already ? Were not the sentiments expressed on the subject by Mr. Bickersteth, Mr. Baptist Noel, Mr. Mortimer, and Mr. Marks,—all eminent clergymen of the English Church—worth remarking ? But ah ! why speculate on the future ? The Lord reigneth ! His own day is hastening forward ; we have as yet seen but the beginning of the end. Events will soon roll on with accelerated speed, increasing in their rapidity more and more, as they reach nearer and nearer to the Great Day. The secession in Scotland was a GREAT Event ; but its greatness will soon be seen chiefly in this : that it was the prelude to far mightier changes. Dear friends ! Let us see to it, that we are ready, with our lamps *trimmed*, and our lights *burning* !

A. B.

## IV.—THE FREE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MAY, 1843.

Desirous of making our First Volume as complete as our space will permit, we insert now a record of the doings of the First Free Assembly, which may be of use for future reference.

*(From the Witness.)*

As the proceedings of the last fortnight will be ever memorable, not only in the history of Scotland, but in the history of Christianity, we purpose to give a continuous, though necessarily brief and abrupt outline of the more important of them.

Thursday, May 18.—This day was one looked forward to with intense interest and anxiety by all, and eagerly wished for by those who had determined to quit the Establishment, and feared the interposing of any plausible temptation which might lead the weak astray.

After a singularly able and impressive discourse from Dr. Welsh, on the limits and extent of private judgment in matters of religion, the Members of Assembly met in St. Andrew's Church, which was densely crowded in every quarter.

Dr. Welsh, the Moderator, having constituted the Assembly in the usual manner, read the Protest which appeared in full in our paper, holding that the Church was coerced by the Civil Courts,—that they had assumed the whole jurisdiction of the Church,—that, as several of the Presbyteries of this Church had been prevented from electing their representatives, that this could be no Free Assembly of the Church of Scotland. After the reading of this Protest, Dr. Welsh, followed by Dr. Chambers, Dr. Gordon, Dr. P. M'Farlan, and the other protesting and adhering ministers and elders, immediately left the house, and marched in procession, amid the applause of the assembled multitude, to the large hall at Canonmills, which had been fitted up for their reception. Dr. Welsh having constituted the new Assembly, Dr. Chalmers was unanimously chosen Moderator. Mr. Pitcairn and Dr. Clason were chosen Clerks of Assembly.

All the adhering ministers were declared members of Assembly. A Committee was appointed to consider the best means of effecting their complete separation from the Established Church. After the appointment of several other Committees, the first meeting of this eventful Assembly adjourned till next day.

On Friday, the Irish Deputation tabled their commission, and afterwards addressed the Assembly, approving of the course they had adopted, and recognising the Free Assembly as the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. On the motion of Dr. Welsh, the Moderator returned the thanks of the Assembly to the Irish Deputation. Dr. Cook of Belfast then addressed the Assembly at great length, approving of the separation, and expressing his grief and disappointment at the course pursued by the Government. In the evening, Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Gordon, and Dr. Candlish addressed the Assembly in powerful speeches on the position which they had now taken up, and the grounds for so doing. An address was read from the adhering probationers. Reports of the number of adhering students in the several Colleges were also given in. The rest of the day was spent in devotional exercises.

On Saturday, Mr. Dunlop gave in an interim report from the Building Section of the Provisional Committee, in which he pointed out the hard-

ships to be endured by many of the adhering ministers in the country districts, from the tyranny of the landlords. Dr. Candlish also gave in an interim report of the statistical or ecclesiastical section of the same Committee, in which he directed the attention of the Assembly to the Christian bearing of those ministers who had such gloomy prospects before them, and the necessity of the Assembly doing everything in its power to mitigate their sufferings, as also that of the people adhering to them. Dr. Chalmers then vacated the chair, and gave in the report of the financial section of the Provisional Committee, from which it appeared that 687 Associations in support of the Free Church had been already formed, but that the success only of 239 had been reported; and from what they had done, a sum equal to £223,028. 6s. could be relied upon as already at the command of the Church; and, besides that, £72,687 1s. 1d. were annual receipts. In the course of reading the Report, he clearly showed what an amount of money could be obtained by diligently carrying out the system of local associations, and the amount of moral good that would be effected by the continual intercourse which would thereby be kept up among all classes of society. On the motion of Dr. Macdonald of Urquhart, a vote of thanks was carried by acclamation to Dr. Chalmers and the other conveners and members of the several sections of the Provisional Committee.

On Monday a number of additional adherents, both ministers and elders, were given in. A memorial from the Paisley Young Men's Society was read. Dr. Candlish gave a verbal report of the proceedings of the Committee on the celebration of the Bicentenary of the Westminster Assembly, in which it was the desire of the Committee to have it on so extensive a scale as would admit of all evangelical Christians engaging in it, that it should be more a testimony against prevailing errors than a declaration of all that each body considers truths. Mr. Dunlop then read the Report on the Five Schemes of the Church, from which it appeared, that a considerable increase had taken place since last year. The Moderator returned the thanks of the Assembly to Dr. Candlish and Mr. Dunlop. In the evening Dr. M'Farlan of Greenock gave in the Report of the Committee appointed to devise the best method of completing the separation from the Establishment, which recommended, that the Assembly pass a resolution demitting their *status* and privileges as ministers and members of the Established Church, and that an act be prepared to that effect, to be signed by all the members of Assembly. Dr. Brewster of Craig seconded the adoption of the Report.

Mr. Beith of Stirling and Dr. Cunningham then addressed the Assembly in long and powerful speeches.

On Tuesday, Mr. Dunlop laid on the table a copy of the Act of Separation, which, after some conversation, was approved of. Mr. M'Lagan, Kinfauns, then offered up a powerful and impressive prayer, adapted to the circumstances in which they were placed, and the act they were about to perform; after which, the document was signed by all the adhering ministers then present. In the evening, a deputation from the London Lay Union addressed the Assembly; after which, a number of the ministers and elders belonging to the English Synod were heard. Mr. Dobbin, from Ireland then spoke. The Moderator returned the thanks of the Assembly to all the deputations, expressing gratitude for their sympathy.

On Wednesday, Dr. Keith of St. Cyrus gave in the Report on the Conversion of the Jews, containing much valuable information from the different missionary stations. The Moderator returned the thanks of the Assembly to Dr. Keith. In the evening, a deputation from the Original Seceders was heard. The Moderator, in returning the thanks of the As-

sembly to the deputation, expressed the high value they set upon the testimony of such a body, who had so long maintained the principles for which the Church of Scotland was now called to suffer. Messrs. Guthrie and Beug then addressed the Assembly in powerful speeches.

On Thursday, a letter was read by Mr. Dunlop from the Marquis of Breadalbane, declaring his determination to cast in his lot with the "Free Church." An Address was also read by Dr. Duncan from the Dissenters in Holland, expressing sympathy with the Evangelical portion of the Church of Scotland, and their high opinion of the noble stand now made by them for the Headship of Christ. Dr. Candlish, seconded by Dr. Keith, moved that it should be recorded and duly answered. The Reports of various Committees were then given in, the most important of which was that on Education, read by Dr. Welsh, for which he received the thanks of the Assembly.

On Friday, several ministers and elders gave in their adherence to the Free Church, one of whom was William Gilmour, Esq. Glasgow. Thanks were voted to Mr. Campbell of Monzie, Mr. Fox Maule, Mr. Stewart, and the other Members of Parliament who had supported the claims of the Church.

Mr. Fairbairn of Saltoun gave in the Report of the Committee on Sabbath observance. The evening was spent in devotional exercises.

On Saturday, a Deed of Demission, to be subscribed by probationers, was read and approved of, to which many adhered at the time, and several have since signed; numbers are yet expected. Further adherences of ministers, elders, and influential friends, were also reported.

Mr. Dunlop gave in the Report on the secular affairs of the Church.

Dr. Cunningham brought forward the Interim Report on the election of office-bearers in the Church, which vested it in the male communicants,—not agreed to till Monday.

On Monday, a number of additional adhering ministers was reported. The Election of Office-Bearers' Report, after some conversation, in which Mr. M. M. Crichton, Dr. M'Farlan, and others, took a part, was agreed to. Mr. Dunlop gave in the Report on the *quoad sacra* churches, which recommended the ministers of these churches to keep them, until forcibly extruded by the civil power, with the exception of the old chapels of ease. The Report on the debt of the Church was then read by Mr. Wood, and means taken to get it liquidated immediately. A letter was read from Mr. Hog of Newliston, giving in his adherence to the Free Church.

In the evening, Dr. Chalmers read the Report of the Financial Committee, from which it appeared that the annual subscriptions now amount to £72,959, and, along with the donations, amount to £232,347, collected in the course of two months from the people of Scotland, in aid of the Free Church. On the motion of Mr. M. M. Crichton, seconded by Mr. Brown of Largo, the thanks of the Assembly were tendered to Dr. Chalmers and the other members of the Committee. Dr. Welsh gave in the Report on Colonial Churches, as also a supplemental one on Education.

On Tuesday the names of additional adherents were read, after which Dr. M'Farlan, Greenock, read an address to the Queen, stating the causes of separation.

In the evening an address was read by a deputation from the Edinburgh Tradesmen's Association. On the motion of Mr. M. M. Crichton the thanks of the Assembly were returned by the Moderator.

An overture for union for prayer was agreed to. Mr. Dunlop gave a verbal report from the Building Committee, in which he urged the necessity of rich congregations being, in the mean time, satisfied with plain churches, until every part of the country be supplied.



Dr. Candlish brought up the Report on the supply of ordinances ; from which it appears that the demand far exceeds the supply.

The thanks of the Assembly were then tendered to Mr. Bonar, Mr. John Hamilton, advocate, and others, for their valuable services to the Church ; after which, Dr. Chalmers delivered an able and eloquent address, before dissolving the Assembly in the name of the great Head of the Church. The next Assembly was appointed to be held in Glasgow in October.

## V.—OUR MADRAS FRIENDS.

We subjoin two extracts from our Madras Cotemporaries—which indicate that the important subject of our Church-Freedom is not forgotten there more than here—and that our friends there feel as much, if they speak and write less, than many others. To the APPEAL we call special attention.

### 1.—THE APPEAL OF THE MADRAS MISSION BOARD OF THE FREE CHURCH.

(From the *Native Herald*.)

The Missionaries in charge of the Scottish Mission in Madras, the Rev. Messrs. ANDERSON, JOHNSTON, and BRAIDWOOD—beg earnestly to call the attention of the readers of the *Native Herald* to the circular that follows. They feel that the very existence, the stability, and the enlargement of the Schools and Mission under their charge, depend in no small degree on the manner in which the Christians of this Presidency shall respond to the present appeal. They are laid under two necessities thus to call for support ;—First, their own resources on which they have drawn since *July* are nearly exhausted,—and, Second, and more especially, the present extraordinary pressure on the funds of the Free Church at home imperatively calls on them to exert themselves to the utmost among their friends and supporters in order to relieve it.

The great work itself, to which they have wholly given themselves, is Catholic in its objects and Scriptural in its principles. It aims at the conversion of young Hindus to Christ by means of His Word and Spirit, and at the raising up, through God's blessing, of a pious, an educated, and an intelligent Native Agency to publish the Gospel to adults, and to teach their young countrymen those lessons and doctrines of the Bible which are able to make them wise unto Salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

Those friends who send contributions will please distinctly to state which of the objects specified it is their desire to support. Should any friend choose to support both, inconvenience will be avoided by his stating how much he is pleased to give *for the expences of the Institution and its Branches*, and how much *for the general purposes of the Mission*.

### CIRCULAR.

At a meeting of the BOARD of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S INSTITUTION and BRANCH SCHOOLS, in connection with the MISSIONARIES OF THE FREE

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, held on Tuesday, the 21st November, 1843, it was *inter alia*, resolved;—

“That the Secretary be instructed to prepare a Circular Letter, containing a brief Statement of the present condition of the Madras Branch of the India Mission of the Free Church of Scotland, its Institution, Branch Schools, &c., with an appeal to Christians in India who, in the present emergency of the Free Church at home, may desire to express their sympathy and co-operation by contributing,—Either to the general purposes of the Mission with a view to the development of its leading object, viz. the raising up of a pious and educated Native Agency to teach and preach the Gospel among the Heathen,—Or to aid and co-operate with the Free Church of Scotland in her endeavours to maintain in its “full efficiency” this branch of her India Mission.”

SIR,—As Secretary of the Board of the General Assembly's Institution and Branch Schools—*now* of the Free Church of Scotland, I am instructed, in terms of the above Resolution, to solicit your sympathy and aid, with reference both to the ordinary wants of the Schools, and to the peculiar necessities of the Mission caused by the present crisis of the Church at home.

The friends and supporters of the Mission and Institution have already been informed, through the Newspapers, of the Resolution of the Board on the 3d of August last, “to continue to manage the Funds and Property as heretofore in connection with the present Missionaries, who had felt it to be their duty to adhere to the Free Church.”

In spite of the shocks and vicissitudes which the Institution has sustained since the baptism of three Hindu youths in 1841, and the struggles which it has been called to maintain against native opposition and obloquy, unexampled in Madras,—through the good hand of God upon it, it is once more in a state of hopeful vigour and prosperity. The number of Pupils now on the Roll is upwards of 400;—230 in the English Department; and in the Tamil, Telugu and Hindustani Schools on the premises—preparatory to English—upwards of 170. This preparatory vernacular Schools, in which the elements of English are also taught, are likely to prove useful auxiliaries in advancing the Christian education and evangelization of India. They are at present of course elementary, but contain within them the hopeful germ of future development.

The BRANCH SCHOOL at *Conjeveram*, now more than *four* years in existence, has been visited periodically, and has contributed largely to spread the knowledge of God's Word among the rising youth in that stronghold of idolatry. It has from the first been deeply indebted to the kind countenance and support of Mr Freese, the Collector of the Zillah of Chingleput, and may yet be made more efficient, as the Mission enlarges its operations. Its present number of Pupils is upwards of 100, including the Tamil preparatory School.

In the CHINGLEPUT School, there are at present nearly 70 Pupils; a large proportion of whom can read the English Bible with considerable intelligence. That School has been more than *three* years in existence, and owes much of its health and vigour to the fostering and watchful care of Mr. MOREHEAD, the Zillah Judge. It is a wellspring of good to the district, and may yet become more so.

The TRIPPLICANE School is the most vigorous of all our Branches. It was commenced in March, 1841, and has steadily increased in interest and efficiency. It now numbers 150 Pupils, about *thirty* of whom are Mahomedans. Between 80 and 90 youths are able to read the English Bible with intelligence. The School is under the care of Mr. Whitely, who is assisted by Native Monitors, and who received his training as a teacher in the Parent

School. The Native Teachers at Conjeveram and Chingleput were also trained in the Parent Institution.

In each of these Schools the Bible is made the centre and life of all the education given; but not to the exclusion of any useful branch of knowledge. With a view to train the mind of the young Hindus and Mahomedans to think, to cultivate their moral feelings, and to prepare them for the duties and business of life, Grammar and Arithmetic, History, Geography, and Mathematics are taught,—but all in subordination to the lessons of God's Word pressed daily home on the conscience,—as the great means of attaining the primary object of the Institution, viz. The salvation of human souls, and the raising up, through the Divine Spirit, of a pious and educated native ministry.

Several hundred youths from all classes and castes of this Community, not excluding Pariah, are at present under the action of the living truths of God's Word, and of quietly drinking in its pure and renovating doctrines.

The *first three Native Converts* are standing stedfast in the Gospel, and are growing in knowledge and grace. In addition to their own studies, preparatory to the Ministry, to enter upon which has been their earnest desire ever since their baptism, each of them teaches for an hour and a half every day a Bible class of their young countrymen with great spirit and acceptance. They are thus acquiring a practical skill in the inculcation of truth and the refutation of error, which, more than any other training, will, under the Divine Blessing, fit them for becoming able and successful evangelists to their people, and for publishing in their own tongues, the Tamil and Telugu, the glorious Gospel of Christ. For many months past they have on Saturdays been allowed, each in his own way, to address, generally in English, and at times in their own language, the whole of the advanced youths of the Institution on the great things of the Gospel. These addresses have been often marked by a spiritual simplicity, a fervour, and an earnestness, that visibly reach and affect the hearts of their heathen brethren.

Prayer, praise, and exposition of God's Word from part of the daily exercises of the Institution, at which all the youths of the English department are present. The singing of the Psalms of David was publicly introduced more than a year ago in the midst of heathen contempt and blasphemy, at a time when our attendance was brought to a low ebb. Many of the youths, both Heathen and Christian, now join voices in the Psalm, at times with apparent delight and always with lively interest.

Besides devoting the whole of Saturday to religious exercises and addresses each of the Missionaries in turn conducts public worship in English in the hall of the Institution, every Sabbath forenoon at *eleven*. This service is mainly designed for Natives who understand English, and has for more than a year been kept up in its present form. It is attended by the Members of the Mission, by a few Christian friends, and by thirty or forty native youths, Monitors and Pupils. It is open to all Christians who sympathize with the Free Church in her present struggle, or who wish to hear the Gospel preached in confection with the heathen.

Through all these various channels, the Word of God is again silently making its way in many a youthful heart. The wood and all things are ready. When the fire from heaven descends, the stony hearts of some of these young idolaters will melt. They will be turned from their dumb idols, and will boldly take up their cross and follow Christ.

The Missionaries of the Free Church need the prayers of all Christians, who desire the salvation of the Hindus, to hold up their hands in a work so great and arduous, and to plead with God to make bare His holy arm in the midst of the heathen around them. With such an important trust com-

mitted to their charge—a trust daily increasing in the depth and largeness of its influences,—they confidently cast the Institution and its interests, Educational and Missionary, on the liberal support and sympathy of all in this Presidency who take an interest in the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

They have gratefully to thank Christians of all denominations for the generous aid which they have hitherto given them. Owing to the peculiar difficulties of the Mission occasioned by baptisms, which for a time so greatly reduced our numbers, no formal appeal has been made to the public for more than two years. Some of its best friends have, during that period, been removed by death and other causes, and the list of Subscribers and Donors has thus been greatly diminished.

The growing prosperity of the Institution and its Branches requires an increased support to meet the increasing expenditure,—increasing by a prosperity which God has been pleased to vouchsafe.

All the money hitherto raised in this country, with the exception of Rupees 3,000 promised by the Committee of the St. Andrew's School to the first Missionary of the General Assembly on his arrival at Madras,—has been exclusively applied to the direct support of the Schools. The salaries of the Missionaries were paid by the Established Church of Scotland up to the end of *June* last; and, now that they have joined the Free Church, they still look to the Christian liberality of its people in Scotland for their permanent support.

Some Christian friends in this Presidency, moved by the present emergency and the extraordinary pressure upon the Funds of the Free Church at home occasioned by the erection of 600 Churches and the sustentation of 700 Ministers and Preachers, have expressed a wish to contribute towards the support of the Missionaries here, in the meantime,—as the best and speediest way of relieving its funds and of maintaining in its “full efficiency” this Branch of its India Mission. This is the more necessary from the loss of their *July* letters in the *Memnon* and the detention of the *August* Mail, by which they have been cut off from all communication with the Committee of the Free Church on India Missions till *January* at the earliest. To maintain the integrity of their principles, and to supply the people of Scotland with a pure and a free Gospel, the aged fathers and brethren in the Ministry have been constrained to throw themselves on the sympathies of Christians in Britain of every denomination to aid them in the present emergency. And there is no reason why their Missionaries in India should hesitate or be ashamed to follow their example.

In addition, then, to Subscriptions and Donations for the Institution and its Branches as formerly, a separate Fund will now be opened for the general purposes of the Mission here, with a view to relieve the India Mission Fund of the Free Church of Scotland.

Contributions to either of the above objects will be thankfully received by the *Secretary*, or by Messrs. BINNY and Co., the *Treasurers*.

I remain, Sir, respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDERSON,  
*Secretary.*

*General Assembly's Mission House: Errabauloo Chetty Street, }  
Madras, 27th November, 1843. }*

## 2.—NOTES FROM A MADRAS JOURNALIST.

*(From the Athenæum.)*

Our readers will, on the delivery of the *Athenæum* of this day's date, receive a *Circular* from the Missionaries of the *Free Church of Scotland*, the object of which being so fully explained by themselves, relieves us in a great degree from the pleasing duty, as we have always found it, of contributing our mite of influence in furtherance of every undertaking identified with the interest of Christian Missions. The appeal of the Board is supported by the most convincing testimony of the value of this native educational establishment, and the experience of past usefulness must be taken into the account, as forming a powerful inducement to Christians of every denomination to come forward on the present occasion with their support. This is we believe the first time these devoted labourers have asked any thing for themselves in connexion with their cause. The present emergency at home demands at their hands that they should do all they can to relieve the pressure there on the funds for the support of the Ministry and Church building. The course adopted is right and proper, and we are persuaded that He, whose is the gold and the silver, will open the hearts of His people to help them in this time of need. It is very probable that some of their old supporters may withdraw their names from the original list of subscribers, this, however, should, and will draw forth more sympathy and aid from other quarters. Their brethren at Bombay and Calcutta have not appealed to Christians in vain, and we see no reason why the same results may not be anticipated among ourselves. No body of Missionaries that we are acquainted with, have a firmer hold on the Native community, and more unreservedly give themselves up to their work. They are untiring in the discharge of their daily duties, and have proved eminently successful in winning their way to the hearts of the Native youths committed to their charge. We advocate their claims solely on the conviction that the work in which they are engaged could not possibly be in better or more efficient hands.

---

In a recent issue we laid before our readers a brief outline containing most interesting and important facts gathered from the Home journals, relative to the great movement of the Free Church of Scotland and its consequences. The intelligence contained in that paper was brought by the September mail; that by the October we now submit, and though it requires a larger space than we can well afford, we question if any subject now in agitation in the mother country is equally deserving of attention. Both at Calcutta and Bombay the feeling of the members of the Scottish Establishment is decidedly favourable to the secession, and the efforts of the seceders are commensurate with the claims which the separation imposes upon them. At Madras, there has been comparatively little said on the absorbing topic; it is however well known that all the Assembly's Missionaries have joined the Free Church, and not a few of the body to which they belonged entertain similar sentiments with them. It is a noble cause, and any aid we can give by affording its advocates' space for matter relating thereto, is bestowed with the cordial expression of our best wishes for its prosperity. Hitherto we have merely glanced at what is going on, but we have narrowly watched the conduct of all concerned and deeply sympathize in the struggle of the devoted men who preferred the relinquishment of their secular advantages, to the violation of their conscientious scruples and the sacrifice of principle. With

reference to three topics of the intelligence which will be found in our columns we could say much, but just now we shall do no more than briefly notice them. The first of these is "*Opposition and its consequences.*" The cry of sacred misery from the Christian Highlanders of Sutherland denied a site for building a house to worship the God of their fathers—from ministers severed from their flocks and refused harbour in the parishes where their heads have grown grey in the service of their Master—and from conscientious tenants, cottars and servants threatened with their landlord's displeasure or thrust out on the wide world without a house or shelter—cannot safely be neglected by any who bear the christian name. To defend the lordly oppressor or to extenuate his conduct, because he is rich and powerful, at the expense of the poor and weak, were to reverse the order of Providence, and would be a reproach to our Maker. Oppression is all the more hateful, when it happens to be backed by power, and when it lifts itself up against the sacred rights of conscience. When its unoffending victims have nought but a good conscience wherewith to resist arbitrary exactions, to oppress or drive them destitute is a cruel infringement on the birthright of every Briton and on the liberty wherewith CHRIST has made His people free. The very worm will turn against the foot that tramples it. Persecution has more than once made even wise men mad.

There is cause for thankfulness, however, that the adherents of the Free Church have, in the midst of much provocation, been hitherto kept from outrage. The Gospel appears then most divine, when it rules the spirits of those that profess it, and enables them to overcome by first overcoming themselves.

It will not have escaped the eye of an attentive observer of these things, that the "*Riots.*" as they are called, at Rosskeen and Tain, have been wonderfully harmless, and like FALSTAFF's men in buckram, have at least frightened the Residuaries, or seemed to frighten them. Under cover of these disturbances, the chuckling Moderates have ordained three or four of their Presentees, quietly in an *inn*, far from their respective parishes. They have thus contrived to save their heads, if there was indeed any danger to them, and to secure without risk or loss, the quarter's stipend for their friends, before the 29th of September. So that these harmless disturbances, which have taken place without accident or a single drop of blood being shed—and that too in the Highlands, have proved quite a windfall to the retainers of place and pension.

The misrepresentations of the hostile press, especially on the subject of Funds—are to the full as ridiculous as they are contemptible. It will be seen from the remarks on the intelligence under this head, what becomes of the £5 a quarter for the Free Church Ministers. Their enemies would starve the Free Churchmen, if they could; but, they will find it easier to starve a true blue Presbyterian Scotchman, than make him change one jot of his principles, especially such principles as are now contended for in Scotland. Dr. CHALMERS, of course, calculated the subscriptions to the cause from May 1843 to May 1844, and found the sum total to be nearly £300,000. In many districts of the country, the adhering people are building their own churches, without drawing on the Central Fund; and many of them after sending in their contributions of it. Upwards of *fifty Churches* are either completed, or in progress towards it, over the whole country. And reckoning the free labour and every other item, the sum total at the last, when the Churches are erected, will be found to be much beyond Dr. CHALMERS' calculation. It will be a sad day for Scotland, when the Ministers of a people who have manifested such a zeal for the cause of Christ shall be paid with £5 a quarter! Their bread will doubtless be given them and their water be made pure, while there is bread and water in Scotland. The third

feature in the intelligence relates to the "*sympathy for the Free Church in England.*"

We refer to the Wesleyan Pastoral Address as a specimen. But it would be endless to enumerate all the expressions of sympathy and generous instances of liberality from the South of the Tweed. These seem only the first fruits of a more enlarged and permanent sympathy and co-operation, among Christians in both kingdoms, equally necessary and advantageous for all. Mr. D. M. MARGILL CRICHTON's letter from Manchester, throws a flood of light on the character and extent of this sympathy.

LOCHIEL's letter closes up all. His Highland pride and obstinacy would not allow him to grant a site for a Church to his tenants some time ago. Finding them as fixed in their purpose not to return to the establishment, as he at first was not to grant them their request, he has at last relented, and promised to give them a site.

Altogether the last month's intelligence is full of graphic incidents, and contains many cheering proofs that the Free Church is advancing to full and complete establishment over the length and breadth of Scotland. She is deeply seated in the warm hearts of the Scottish people, and the blessing from on high is manifestly resting upon her congregations and pastors, whether they meet to worship the God of their fathers in the humble but free tabernacles, or under the wide canopy of heaven—the Church of her former martyrs and confessors.

## VI.—THE RESIDUARY PLACIN'.

*Peter*—Gude e'en t'ye gude folk. Hoo's a' wi'ye the nicht?

*John*—Come awa' Peter. Hoo are ye a' up by?

*Peter*—We're a' stappin' about. Are ye baith aboot ye'er ordnar?

*John*—Deed we're muckle better nor we deserve to be. We've muckle, muckle to be thankful for, and joost naething awa' to compleen o'.

*Peter*—What for was ye no at the placin' the day? Ye're no for ordnar oot o' the gate whan preechin's in haun.

*Leezy*—Oh Peter, wad ye hae had us sit an' hear a doonricht lee spoken i' the very Kirk whar we've sae aften heard the blessed soon' o' gospel troth?

*Peter*—What d'ye mean Leezy by a doonricht lee? Ye wad hae heard a gude sermon frae Mr. Penny that nicht hae done ye gude.

*Leezy*—Is't ony thing short o' a doonricht black lee to declare in Mr. Paul's ain poopit that ony body but himsell's the minister o' this pairish? I pit it to ye'ersell Peter Hooeson; is ony body but Mr. Paul the minister o' this pairish?

*Peter*—Weel I'll no say but we wad a' wuss it war sae: but ye ken it isna sae, and we maun joost submit.

*Leezy*—An' what for is't na sae? What for maun we submit? Did na the Lord jine us thegither as pastor and people, and what po'or but his ain can part us? As lang's Mr. Paul's heed's aboon the grun, he's the minister o' this pairishin.

*Peter*—Ye ken as weel as me, Leezy, that the law o' the laun has separated us, and that's the po'or we maun submit to.

*Leezy*—The law o' the laun! I'm thinkin' it was the law o' the laun' that dung the bluidy Clavers's pistol-bullet into auld John Broon o' Priesthill's brains. It was the law o' the laun that stuck the worthy Mr. Goothrie's head for the craws to pike on the Netherbow Port, and sent the gude Argyll and hunders mae oot o' this wicked warl.

*John*—Wheesht! Wheesht! Leezy, Dinna wrang a gude cause by fleein into a paushion. Peter's richt aneuch and ye're richt aneuch. The law o' the laun has dune a' it can doe. It has made anither minister o' the pairishin, sae far as the steepin' and the manse and the glybe's concerned; but Mr. Paul's the minister o' the pairish in respect o' a' the hairts that's in't. An' lang may the Lord in his mercy spare him to gang in an' oot amang us.

*Leezy*—Atweel gudeman that's as true a wòrd as e'er ye spak. We canna warsle against what's ordeened. We maun e'en let the glybe and the steepins gang; but I wad na gie that streek o' lint for a' the steepins o' a' the ministers in braid Scotlan', if they hae na souls for their hire, and hoo can ony minister expect to hae that, if he be the servint o' the law o' the laun, an' begins his ministry wie a lee in his richt haun?

*Peter*—That's a' true nae doot; but what's to be dune? It's impossible for a pairish like this to mainfteen a minister, even wi' what help we might get frae the sustentation fund.

*Leezy*—Hoot awa' man! there's nae fear o' that. Whar there's a wull there's a wic.

*Peter*—It's no possible woman. If ye had been at the Kirk the day ye wad hae heard Mr. Penny mak it as plain as day-licht that we canna possibly keep a minister without impovercezin' oursells.

*Leezy*—Deed I think Mr. Penny might hae gotten a fitter subject for an ordination sermon. But if I had been i' the Kirk he wad hae haen to blaw at an oot peet if he had tried to convince me o' ony sic thing. We've been but burstin bodies a' oor days, but tho' I say't that sud na say't, there no twa hauns i' the pairish hae turned mair gude lint into gude yirn nor thae same twa.

*John*—That's true Leezy, whae'er be the sayer o't. D'ye min' hoo oor Jamie that's gane used to lauch an' say he thocht if he war gaun to the gaulas, ye wad be weel content if only he gaed wi' a clean linen sark o' ye'er ain spinnin'.

*Leezy*—Weel if the Lord spare me helth and strength I houp to spin mony a spinel yet, and they'll aye be a merk at fo'rt as lang's there's a gentleman i' the laun that likes a dacent shirt better nor thae cotton trash; an' a cut in every hank I'se coont it a preevilige to gie for supportin' the Lord's servant.

*Peter*—Muckle will twa three cuts o' yirn do for him.

*John*—Aye Peter but min' what the great Dr. Chalmers said in his lecture that nicht; "I've great confidence (said the Doctor) i' the poor o' littles," an' tho' we mauna say there mony as gude spinners i' the pairish as the gudewife there, yet a' can gie something; and the tiler



can mak a coat, or set apairt the price o' makin ane, and the mairchan can gie the black claith for't, and ae fermer can gie a bow o' meal and anither a cart o' potauties, and a third a fat wadder, and a fourt some fleeshes o' woo', and the grocer a quarter a' hunder o' sugar, and the cairter can ca' his coals; an' I'm muckle mistaen, Peter, for a' ye say and for a' that Mr. Penny has been blawin' into ye'er lug, if you and me wull be mony days aulder afore we're baith castin' oor coats to trench the moor that Mr. Widecrafts has gi'en us, and makin' a bonny gairden smile i' the wulderness for oor ain minister.

*Peter*—Oh for a' that's come and gaen I wad nā objec' to do a neebor's turn like that; an' this I wull say that Mr. Paul weel deserves at oor hauns a' we can do for him, tho' he was raither sair on the like o' me whiles if we stayed o'er late at a merkato sic like. Hoosomever, I wad wullinly do what I can if it war na that I gather frae Mr. Penny's address that the Laird wunna be o'er well pleesed if his tenants tak muckle share i' the Free Kirk's proceedins. It's no that he's sair against the thing himsell, but ye ken he's a Supporter o' the government; and I'm thinkin' they wad gie him his kail through the reek, if he let his tenants do muckle in that way. Deed I heard that he had a letter frae Lunnun this mornin' frankit by Sir Jumes Grame, and if a' stories be true that was the very subjec' o't.

*John*—Oh Peter, Peter, believe the word o' an auld man—an auld man that has seen muckle sorrow frae first to last. Ye're a young man yet, an' wha kens what may be in store for you. But tak ye ma word for't, ye'll ken belyve, if ye suffer a tenth pairt o' what I've dune, ye'll lairn, I say, whether its better to hae Sir Jumes Grame or the Lord Jesus Christ for yeer freen.

## VII.—OPENING AND CLOSE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

[The late, irregular and protracted delivery of the Home Mail prevents our giving any digest of the proceedings of the Second Free General Assembly held at Glasgow in the month of October last. We give its key note and cadence, in the opening and closing of its proceedings:—in which our readers will find more that it is directly spiritual than was once usual on such occasions. The meeting was distinguished by solemnity, unanimity, great animation and determined purpose. The heavy trial of a very reduced income, for the present year, was heard announced without a murmur, or word of doubt or dissatisfaction, by the hundreds of ministers present;—and a determination to raise all the necessary funds for carrying on all the usual schemes of usefulness in the world and in the Church, at home and abroad, to Jew and to Gentile, was expressed and acted upon.

Probably there never was such a gathering of deputations, or of communications from the different sections of the visible Church to express sympathy and love, as at this last Assembly:—and no sight could have been more touching than to have seen good old MALAN of Geneva, that man of God, overcome by his feelings, making his way up to the Moderator's chair, seizing, grasping and shaking him by the hand, whilst the tears flowed down his cheeks! Are such things as these no Testimony! But, more of this afterwards.

We also subjoin a short survey of the Assembly's proceedings, from a very impartial source, the *Edinburgh Scotsman Journal*. A few months ago it was the bitterest, and almost the ablest, foe which the FREE CHURCH had in Scotland; but now it is almost an admirer, by compulsion—the compulsion of conviction. Such testimony is honourable and kind; and to some of our readers may be peculiarly acceptable and useful. Thus the Lord turns the hearts of some enemies to testify, whilst he leaves others to test us.]

### FREE CHURCH ASSEMBLY.

This body met on 17th October at Glasgow. Dr. Chalmers having taken his seat in the Moderator's chair, after offering up an impressive prayer, proceeded to preach, taking his text from Nehemiah xi., verse 16. At the close of the discourse the roll of the Assembly was called over, and a number of new commissions were given in. Among those deputed to attend from distant churches, the Rev. Cesar Malan, of Geneva, attracted much attention. The Marquis of Breadalbane and the Hon. Fox. Maule were present, and were warmly received on their entrance.

Dr. Chalmers then said,—Reverend fathers and brethren, it is now time that the Assembly should proceed to the election of a new Moderator; but, before quitting the chair, I beg to return the most grateful acknowledgments to you all for the amount of indulgence I have gotten at your hands. And I have now, as the last act appertaining to the office to which your kindness had preferred me, to propose for your acceptance, as my successor, one of whom I am confident that not only his high standing in the Church, but his mild, and paternal, and apostolical virtues will recommend him to the cordial and unanimous suffrages of this venerable Court—Dr. Thomas Brown, of Glasgow, (cheers)—one to whom belongs in no common degree the characteristics of that “wisdom which cometh down from above;” for while, along with 470 of his associates in the ministry, he, by giving up his former all, rather than do violence to his principles,

has thus afforded the best guarantee of being "first pure," I could not fix upon any individual of this whole number who better exemplifies all the remaining attributes of this heavenly wisdom—"First pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and of good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." His is not only the wisdom which qualifies him for such a charge, but his is pre-eminently and distinctively the "meekness of wisdom." It is, therefore, with singular pleasure that I recommend him as the fitting head and representative of this body of ministers and elders, who have come together, not for fierce and fiery debate, but for free yet friendly deliberation on such subjects as are alike dear to philanthropy and piety, actuated by the single principles of glory to God and good will to men."

Dr. M'Farlan, of Greenock, seconded the motion.

Dr. Brown, who was then conducted to the chair, addressed the Assembly as follows:—Rev. fathers and brethren, I think you most sincerely for the honour that you have done me. I am very unfit for the performance of the duties to which, in the providence of God, I am now called. I shall enter on these duties, trusting to your indulgence and your forbearance, which I am sure I shall meet with, and looking to Him whose grace is promised to be made sufficient for us, and whose strength is perfected in our weakness. Rev. fathers and brethren, we are not honoured this day with the presence of the representative of Majesty, but I trust that the presence of our Lord and Master is with us, and that the shout of Zion's King will be among us. We meet not at this time for the purpose of framing a new constitution for the Church of Scotland. That constitution, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, has been framed by the skill and the wisdom of our forefathers—the men of eminence and the men of God of former times—our Protestant Reformers; and it existed before it was brought into connection with the State at all. By that constitution we abide stedfastly. Our Standards, our Books of Discipline, our Creed, our Confession of Faith, we retain in all their original integrity. To them we have adhered—to them we have appealed—by them we have sought to be tested in all our recent contendings; but we were divided as men of extravagant views, of presumptuous ideas. We therefore, this being the case, maintain that we are the Church of Scotland. Deprived of her civil privileges, and denuded as she is of her State countenance, we have protested, and we do protest, and we will be borne out in the estimation of all men that are unprejudiced and capable of judging, that in our doctrine, and our polity, and our discipline, and our worship, we represent the Church of our fathers. (Cheers.) We are the true Church that was originally recognised by the State—the Church that could exist and did exist independent of the State—the Church that was assumed by the State, never to be tampered with in her righteous domain, and never to be trammelled in the exercise of her spiritual functions. (Cheers.) We are the Church that has passed through great tribulations—through fire and through water—the Church that has passed through the hottest persecutions, and yet remains unscathed, like the bush that was burning and was not consumed. Such is the Free Church of Scotland; and this is its second holy convocation—this is its second general assembly. We have met, reverend fathers and brethren, for very important purposes. Our deliberations will have respect to the inward regulations and to the outward machinery that are essential to the Church's usefulness and to the Church's stability; and I trust that the wise and holy considerations that have been brought under our notice this day, and pressed upon us with so much energy and affectionate eloquence, will not be lost upon any one of us. We meet in a prayerful spirit; and I trust that a prayer-

ful spirit will be maintained throughout; and that in all our deliberations we shall still look upwards. This is no arena of strife. This is no field of conflict. Here there is to be no self-pleasing or self-seeking. We meet as brethren animated with one heart and with one mind, striving together in the maintenance of those great principles that we have given forth to the world. If any shade of diversity of opinion exists amongst us, I trust there will be no division of affection, and no division of principle. Our union is our glory. If I were allowed to give an advice, I would say to every individual in this great assembly, approach every question which comes before you with that solemnity that its importance does bespeak. Approach every question as Christian men and as Christian ministers. Realise the presence of God. Think of your responsibility to your Church, and think of your responsibility to the Great Head of the Church! Oh! I beg of you, as I would wish to do myself, bear in mind that time is to be coupled with eternity, and that all our sayings and all our doings are to be connected with that eternal reckoning which is to be given at last in the presence of our God. If I were allowed to go beyond the limits of this Assembly, and address the Christian people who have congregated here to-day to witness our meeting and our proceedings, I would say, Brethren in the Lord, pray for us. Pray for us. We have need of your prayers. Pray for us privately—pray for us in your domestic circles. Pray for the builders of the sacred edifice, that their hands may be strengthened, that their minds may be enlightened, and that they may go forward to their sacred duties in the strength of the Lord. And oh! may it be said by you and by all of us, and said by an unthinking and undiscerning world, the Lord has been in the midst of us of a truth. I commend you all to God, and to the word of His Grace. May He lead you—may He guide you—may He strengthen, and help, and uphold you in the way you should go!—*London Mail.*

#### CLOSE OF THE ASSEMBLY.

Mr. DUNLOP then rose and said,—Moderator,—I beg to propose that the next meeting of Assembly be held in Edinburgh on Thursday the 16th of May next. In making this intimation, I hope the house will allow me to express our thankful and grateful sense of the unanimity, harmony, and blessed peace which have reigned amongst us. Some questions have arisen that might have caused difference of opinion; but that cordial feeling has existed which must have disappointed the hopes of our foes, while it has realized the fondest expectations of our friends; and we cannot but hail it as a token for good, which should inspire us with the confidence that the Almighty has blessed us, and been with us. We cannot but feel that there is a difference, and a great difference too, between our first meeting, which was held in Edinburgh, and the present. We now see clearly what we have to do; and yet I rejoice to think that though we have not met here with excitement and enthusiasm, we have met with calm earnestness, and set our faces to our difficulties, to struggle through them, and, by God's blessing, we will overcome. The cheerful temper of our ministers is gratifying in the extreme, and the contentment with which they received the intimation of the small allowance from the Sustentation Fund, with which they must retire to their homes, must have excited the admiration and touched the feelings of all of us. I trust that we, the elders and members of the Free Church, will feel it our duty to make our sacrifices as disinterested and as noble as they have made

theirs; and I hope that we will soon be able to gladden their hearts, and show that we are worthy to have them for our pastors, by providing adequate sustenance, and, in some degree at least, compensating them for sacrifices they had made. (Hear, hear.) I move, therefore, that the next Assembly meet at Edinburgh on 16th May 1844.

The proposition was cordially agreed to.

The MODERATOR, Dr. Brown, then addressed the Assembly in the following terms:—

REVEREND FATHERS AND BRETHREN,—The important business of this Assembly is now brought to a close, and before it is dissolved, and ere we separate, and depart to our different homes and respective spheres of duty, it becomes me, according to usual custom, to address to you a few parting words.

And, in the outset, I cannot forbear acknowledging, with unfeigned gratitude, the honour you have done me in placing me in this chair. However much I might prize this distinction, yet all who know me are aware how much I shrink from it, conscious as I was of my unfitness to discharge aright, and to your satisfaction, the duties devolving on me. Your unmerited partiality, however, overcame my reluctance, and your forbearance has rendered my task lighter than my forebodings led me to anticipate.

The place in which this Assembly of our Free Church has been held, presses upon our notice what took place in a similar convocation here upwards of two hundred years ago; and it would be unpardonable in me to pass it over in silence. In November, 1638, the last General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was held in Glasgow; and if we consider the state of the nation, and the state of the Church, at the period,—if we consider the character of the men who composed that Assembly, the subjects that came before it for discussion, the manner in which its proceedings were conducted, the presence and the power of God that evidently rested upon it, and the issue and result of the whole, it may be safely affirmed that in many respects, it was the most interesting, eventful, and solemn Assembly that was ever held in the kingdom; and as has been well said by a living author, one of ourselves—"A glory, sacred, and imperishable, must ever rest on the memory of that venerable Assembly, whom God honoured to accomplish Scotland's Second Reformation."

It would be out of place here, and at this time, to enter into detail on what took place on that solemn occasion; but I cannot forbear mentioning that, trying as our circumstances have of late been, our forefathers at that period were placed in a more painful situation. Then a semi-Popish and arbitrary prince swayed the sceptre. Then the purpose was formed of crushing Presbytery, and establishing Prelacy on its ruins. And although this sacred convocation was professedly called, and was by the Church and nation understood to be called, for the purpose of considering and correcting errors and abuses, and although it was named a free General Assembly, it was rather nicknamed so; for the representative of majesty came down and appeared in the midst of them, armed with full power to carry out his own views, and the views of his sovereign,—to check all free discussion,—to prevent the correction of those abuses and corruptions that had crept into the Church,—to defend the bishops who then existed, in the possession of their usurped and unconstitutional power,—and to maintain the King's alleged prerogative as supreme judge over all causes ecclesiastical, as well as civil. He found, however, that both he and his prince were led away by a delusive dream. He found that a spirit of zeal for Christ's cause existed in that Assembly that could not be quenched,—a strength of principle that could not be overborne. He found that he had to deal with men that were able to speak with their adversaries in the gate, and to build the old waste

places, in spite of all opposition. The Commissioner, finding that all his attempts to allure or to coerce were vain,—that no protestations, no threats of his, could be of avail in inducing these men of God to swerve from their purpose, at length protested against all farther proceedings, declared the Assembly dissolved, and indignantly took his leave. This did not, however, stagger these holy men. They had taken their ground,—they knew their rights and their privileges,—they felt, as their Moderator well said, that “if the Lord Commissioner was zealous for his royal master, they ought to be zealous for *their* Lord and Master, and must maintain the liberties and privileges of his kingdom.” They proceeded calmly and dispassionately, yet firmly and prayerfully, to carry out the important business for which they had assembled, and, by God’s good hand upon them, they brought it to a successful and happy completion; the Moderator emphatically and solemnly saying, “We have now cast down the walls of Jericho; let him that rebuildeth them beware of the curse of Hiel the Bethelite;” and, adds the historian, “so all the members departed with great comfort and humble joy, casting themselves and the Church, over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, into the arms of their gracious God.”

And how was it that, on this momentous occasion, they prospered and triumphed? Just because under God they were united. There were no jarring elements amongst them, no discordant voices, no clashing sentiments. Their eye was single; they were of one heart and of one mind; they were one in purpose, in aim, in judgement, in action; they thought, and spake, and acted as one man.

And had a similar spirit animated the members of the Established Church at its last meeting of Assembly, and had the Church been true to herself, and faithful to her Divine Lord,—had they as one man stood up for the maintenance of our constitutional rights and privileges,—the painful disruption that then took place had been averted; our Church had stood firm and entire, the glory of our land, and the admiration of the world; and whether the representative of majesty had felt himself called on to leave the Assembly or not, we had not been compelled to leave it. But our councils were divided. There were those among us who did not feel aggrieved,—who saw no need for any change,—who would have things remain as they were, and who, in perfect consistency with their avowed principles and uniform conduct, were willing to submit to the dicta and explanations of Civil Courts in matters spiritual; and there were those who, casting their former protestations to the winds, did, in violation of their avowed principles, unite with those with whom they never had acted heretofore in robbing the Church of her liberty and glory, and riveting around their own necks the chains of arbitrary civil sway. I will not characterise the conduct of either; to their own Master they stand or fall; but this I will say, that the time may come when they shall sorely rue the day when, overlooking Christ’s claims and the Church’s rights, they never said to those in power, “Beware;” but tamely put their necks under the yoke, and in a few short hours swept away all those decisions and enactments which, for years, we had been labouring to pass and enforce, for the purity, the beauty, the glory, the stability, the enlargement of our Church; and if those who were once with us, but have now gone from us, retain their present position in the Church with a peaceful mind, and with the character of consistency in the estimation of reflecting men, I shall indeed wonder greatly. But passing from these topics, at which I was led naturally to glance, let me advert shortly to our own proceedings in this place.

As I said when I was first brought before you, so I say again, we came together, not for the purpose of laying any new platform, or erecting a new ecclesiastical structure, but for the purpose of adhibiting those adminicles

that may render that structure more stable and permanent, and presenting it to the eye of the beholder in all its native beauty, in all its pristine loveliness, in all its original strength. We assemble to give effect to our original laws and regulations for the maintenance of the Church's existence and purity,—to adopt resolutions for meeting the new and unprecedented circumstances in which we have been placed,—to devise measures for the more extensive diffusion of divine truth, “that the law might go forth of Zion more widely, that the word of the Lord might be proclaimed more loudly from Jerusalem,”—the grand purpose for which a visible Church have been instituted, and for which it is allowed to exist. We came together to deliberate as to the internal regulation of the house of God,—not to legislate about forms and ceremonies, and the priests' vestments, but to direct, countenance, and encourage and strengthen, the hands of the man of God, in the execution of his trust of awful importance, while we have been careful to have respect to, and secure, the Christian people's dearest privileges, and to promote their best interests. We assembled together also to sanction and carry forward those plans that have been adopted, and, blessed be God, pursued with so much success, and to devise new measures for the outward maintenance of the Church, for the erection of sanctuaries throughout the land, and for the sustentation of those ministers who now occupy, or may be called in providence to occupy them, in after days and coming years. We came together, not to provide for the present emergency merely, and for ourselves alone,—we have taken a wider range as to time and men. Looking through the vista of time, bringing before our minds, and bearing on our hearts generations yet unborn (although God only knows what the purposes of God, for weal or for woe, may be in regard to ourselves, in regard to our Church, in regard to our nation), but remembering that the Word of God endureth for ever,—that Christ shall have a seed to serve him while sun and moon endure,—and recollecting that present duty is ours, we have assembled to deliberate, to devise, in God's strength, for the behoof of children's children, in God's name to lay the foundation of that scheme by which the divine glory may be promoted, and Christ's kingdom advanced, by which, through the length and breadth of the land, the gospel may be published, and its ordinances dispensed in purity, and its ministers sustained in comfort; that, when we and this generation shall have passed away and been carried to our fathers,—while Scotland exists as a nation,—the memory of this Assembly may not be forgotten, and its proceedings and its provisions may be looked back to by God's people in another age, with gratitude to God, and with thankfulness for those instruments whom He in his providence raised up for their benefit. And gladly would we hope that, in these respects we have succeeded, through God's blessing upon us. While we look not to ourselves, and would ever bear in mind that the wisdom of man is foolishness, and the strength of man is weakness, yet in weighty deliberations we have been engaged, wise resolutions have been formed, and salutary regulations have been passed, all bearing upon the purity, the stability, the permanence of the Church. And, withal, there has been in this Assembly a wisdom, a prudence, a skill, a zeal, a forethought, a painstaking, a union, and harmony and kindness feeling, amidst the variety and multiplicity of objects that have engaged our attention,—all combined and sanctified by a spirit of piety and prayer that has rarely been witnessed, and which enables us to thank God and take courage. Yes, I congratulate you, and give God thanks for that solemnity of feeling,—that prayerfulness of spirit,—that unity of sentiment,—that harmony of love that have pervaded this whole Assembly, and been mixed up with all our deliberations. It has been truly a Christian convocation, not unworthy of being named in connection with that great Assembly to which I have adverted in the outset.

I do trust that that spirit of harmony and brotherly love which has prevailed in this Assembly will follow us into all our humbler meetings and in all our minuter details, for the advancement of the interests of our Free Church; yea, that Christian affection will pervade the whole community adhering to our Church, in all the walks of life; that the Christian unanimity that has characterised this great meeting, congregated from all parts of the kingdom, and composed of men of all ranks, and circumstances, and occupations, and education, and talents, will emanate thence, as from a great centre, a mighty reservoir, and find its way to all the ramifications of our Church,—find its way into the Presbytery, the Session, the congregation, the private association, the domestic circle,—so that all may take knowledge of us, and it may be said of us, as was said of the primitive Christians, “Behold how they love one another.” We are united by our common difficulties and our common trials; but the grand chain that is to bind us together lastingly and firmly, is Christian principle and Christian affection. And oh, brethren in the Lord! if now, or at any future period, the demon of discord should find his way into the midst of us (what our adversaries devoutly wish, anticipate, and prognosticate), farewell to our prosperity, farewell to the growth and existence of vital godliness among us. Strive, pray, sacrifice all but principle to keep united. Remember that even Christ pleased not himself. Listen to the apostolic admonition, “With all lowliness, and meekness, and long-suffering, forbearing one another in love: endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.”

Many important subjects have come before us, which I am called upon to look back to. It has been stated, and the Church and the public were partly aware of it, that very great efforts have been made, since we last separated, for preaching the gospel in every corner of Scotland. At our last Assembly we purposed making the whole of Scotland a field for missionary enterprise; we purposed that our labours should be co-extensive with Scotland's limits and Scotland's necessities, and the pledge has been redeemed. I will venture to say, that the gospel never was so fully and freely, and extensively and faithfully preached in Scotland, since Scotland was a nation, as it has been during the last few summer months. Our ministers and preachers have been itinerating with apostolic zeal, from the Shetland and Orkney Isles, to the Solway Frith. In former times, we did know the grievous destitution under which many districts laboured for lack of the bread of life. This arose not merely from want of labourers, but from the want of faithful labourers. Many parishes, through neglect, or worse than neglect, were absolutely moral deserts. And notwithstanding all the destitution, and our knowledge of it, we could not, we dared not to send them relief. A line of circumvallation, as a Chinese wall, encircled them, which we dared not to approach. We might look over it, but we must not venture to break it down. I do not say that in many cases this might not be proper, and that every labourer ought to have his own vineyard; but it will not apply universally. The Church is bound to see that every man does his duty, and not to allow sinners to die in their sins through the carelessness, or otherwise, of the accredited and hedged-in labourer. It was truly painful for a faithful ambassador of Christ to know of souls perishing in ignorance and in error, and yet not dare on any account to cross the defined limit, to proclaim his Lord's message, and to point to the way of salvation by the blood of the cross. But this state of things no longer prevails. These barriers have been removed and swept away. Our ministers, under the direction of their respective Presbyteries, have gone forth and scattered the seed of the Word in every corner. They have preached by the sea-shore, or the river's brink, or the retired glen, or the



mountain side, and in many instances with powerful and blessed effect. In many of the districts which they visited, the doctrine which they preached, or their mode of preaching it, was new. In many corners, the cold, chilling, at best but moral disquisitions and addresses, issuing from many pulpits (we make exceptions), had induced an apathetic indifference to the things of God and eternity; but the soul-melting, heart-subduing strains of the gospel, accompanied by stirring appeals to the conscience, aroused, and captivated, and enchained many. Many a parched spot has thus been watered and refreshed, and many a soul, we doubt not, has been brought to the knowledge of the truth, and won to the Saviour. Had no other good effects flowed from the disruption, this of itself is a blessed consummation, proving that God can, and will, bring good out of evil; for, oh, what are all our movements to be directed to! what are we to covet, what are we to sigh for, but that a people may be gained unto the Lord, and brands plucked from the everlasting burning? And as a consequence of this, the number of adherents to the Free Church has been vastly increased. In preaching Christ, there was a necessity for preaching him fully, preaching him as the King of Zion, the sole Head of his Church,—the Ruler in his own house; and this led, naturally and necessarily, to the subject of controversy; and thus many hearing what had never reached their ears before, they were led to think, and reflect, and compare, and judge, and choose; and thus, from being ignorant, have received light,—from being indifferent, have been aroused,—ay, from being inimical, have become warm friends, and the cry from every quarter is, “Come and help us.” Thus, in many Presbyteries where the adhering ministers were few, the adhering congregations have more than doubled, so that, as I said, it is a national Church, for which we are called to provide. The whole history of this controversy and its results have led us to see, that if men are open to conviction, and enlightened in the merits of the question,—if they are not armed with prejudice, led away by party spirit, or influenced by carnal policy, or views of expediency,—whenever they take the Bible in their hands, and the standards of the Church in their hands, and listen to their decisions, they must perceive that truth, and equity, and reason lie with us; that what the Church demanded, and civil authority refused, was nothing more than what was righteously claimed, and ought to have been readily granted.

In looking back on our past proceedings, I am sure I speak the sentiments of every member of this Assembly, when I say, that nothing has awakened greater gratitude to the Most High, or kindled more lively joy in every bosom, than the intelligence that has reached us in regard to our Christian schemes of philanthropy, and especially in respect to our Foreign Missions. I consider it to be one of the highest honours of a Christian Church, as it is its bounden duty, to feel for the lost and the perishing in every clime, whether Jew or Gentile, and to do everything in our power to remove the scales from their eyes, and the veil from their hearts, and to bring near to them the knowledge of the Saviour. Every Christian Church is then pursuing its most legitimate course,—is performing its most holy and characteristic work. And in our former Assemblies of late years, we have observed how much this has been felt. We have often witnessed with delight that feeling of sacredness that seemed to pervade the whole House, when the schemes of the Church were brought under consideration. Every man seemed then to feel that he stood on holier ground, that he breathed a purer atmosphere,—the arena of strife was then forsaken, the conflicts of party then terminated. The Church of Scotland has, as a Church, in proportion to its limited means, done as much for the amelioration of men’s spiritual condition, at home and abroad, as any Church in Christendom (whether it will do the same now remains to be proved). Our Free Church

will, in God's strength, continue her efforts with unabated vigour. And it is matter of congratulation and thanksgiving to God, that the funds for the schemes, so far as the two collections go,—these afford a fair criterion for judging,—are not likely to fall off. They have so far considerably increased above those of former years, notwithstanding all the efforts that have been making for our home ecclesiastical fabric. This lets us see what a Christian community can do, when its Christian zeal and charity are awakened, and sanctified, and fanned by the Spirit of God; and it lets us see from what quarter and from what congregations our resources were derived in times gone by. But leaving these considerations, I may surely affirm, that the appearance in the midst of us of one of our most gifted and devoted missionaries, and his declaration, with that of his brethren who are conjoined with him in missionary enterprise,—and then the declaration of these talented and holy men who have been labouring so indefatigably among the outcasts of Israel,—and then again the declaration of that distinguished missionary, Dr. Duff, together with that noble band of Christian labourers, who, with him, are plying their sacred work on the banks of the Ganges,—and, lastly, the declaration of our other talented and pious missionaries at Madras,—fills us with the most heartfelt joy. These all unite, to a man, in their Christian sympathy. Not merely so; they cast in their lot with their brethren of the Free Church of Scotland, and are prepared to share in all their toils, and difficulties, and privations, and sufferings. They virtually declare that whatever those in power may have done in compelling the Church to part with her rightful inheritance, and however low she may appear in the estimation of the unthinking merc men of the world, great or small, she holds a loftier position far than she ever did,—a brighter glory far is hers than she ever possessed,—and she stands higher far in the estimation of the wise and the good than she ever did; and she cannot fail to have the approval of her Lord and Master. We have had addresses and congratulations from various Christian bodies, given forth in all the warmth and sincerity of their hearts, saying, “The Lord bless and keep you; the Lord establish the work of your hands. We bless you in the name of the Lord.” From sister Churches at home, from foreign Churches abroad, from representatives from almost every Protestant community on the face of the globe, and that could hear and know of our doings, we have had the Christian felicitation,—and for this we desire to be grateful, and would reciprocate the Christian good wish and prayer; but we feel, and they will admit, that this is the most powerful and unequivocal testimony that has been borne to our principles as being conformable to truth,—and being of God. Here are Christian men, and these not a few, men universally allowed to be possessed of great grasp of mind, strength of judgment, and clearness of apprehension,—men of admitted sterling Christian principle, of unfeigned piety, and ardent zeal, labouring in the cause of Christ in all the different quarters of the globe, removed far from the scene of controversy, separated far from each other, uninfluenced by local prejudice, without communication one with the other, fully aware of all our proceedings from first to last, fully capable of entering into and comprehending and judging of the merits of the whole question,—we find these men declaring, as with one voice, unequivocally, and without hesitation and reservation, that they cannot, as matters now stand, longer remain in connection with the Church of the Establishment, however dear to them as the Church of their fathers, and that they must unite themselves with and adhere to, and cast in their lot with, their brethren who have protested against the Established Church as now constituted, and have come out of her.

We inquire not into the motives that might naturally have induced these Christian men to remain in their former connection. These are numerous and strong, and might have operated on men of carnal minds and worldly

policy ; but all these they have cast away from them when duty and principle were concerned. They have viewed this whole matter in the light of God's Word, as borne upon by our Confession and Creed, and Books of Discipline,—they have considered how it was operated upon both by ecclesiastical and civil statute, how their ordination vows would be affected thereby. They have brought the whole before the bar of an enlightened conscience, and thus have they judged, and decided, and acted. Their conduct may well lead unthinking men to consider, reflecting men to consider, and Christian men to admire and adore.

Need I say, that the reports in regard to our finances,—the plans of education that are in progress, and speedily to be carried into execution,—are such as may fill our minds, in the infant state of our Church, with the most heartfelt gratitude, and lead us to cherish the hope that the Lord will abundantly prosper our exertions and bless our Zion ; and though we must have our difficulties to struggle with in our present condition, yet these, we trust, under God, will be gradually lessened, and that, in God's good time, the labours in which we are engaged will be crowned with abundant success. Wisdom, and prudence, and caution, combined with zeal and prayer, must all be called into operation and active exercise, in the building of our ecclesiastical fabric ; and let it ever be borne in mind, that we are in an incipient state, and that it must require time for the consolidating and for the upholding of our Church. And we have also under our consideration different questions relative to the calls and appointment of ministers, as in olden times ; and as the decisions have been come to amicably, so we trust they will turn to the advancement of the interests of religion generally.

But, it may be said, has nothing come under our review and notice, and proved the subject of deliberation, fitted to excite pain and distress. Have we had nothing but the sunshine and the sweet to mark and record ? No ; we have heard, as we had learned for a length of time, of what is fitted to embitter our heart ; and we do not repine at this. It would not be well either for churches or individuals were they always crowned with prosperity, were the roads always smooth, the sky always cloudless. We require trouble. The wall of Jerusalem has often been built in troublous times. Zion, we are told, shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness. Our ministers, and those adhering to them, have been subjected, through the infatuation of those in power and influence, or their minions, in many quarters, to a degree of hardship, oppression, and cruelty, more befitting the days of a Charles, than those in which our lot has been cast. Some of our godly ministers have been refused a shelter for their own heads and those of their families within the precincts of their former labours, and those threatened who ventured to protect them. Many have been threatened with the displeasure of landlords and masters, should they refuse to attend the ministrations of one who has been thrust upon them, and dare to give the preference to the pastor of their affections, by whom their souls have been fed and edified, but who is now cast out. And in many parishes a large and wide-spread community have been denied, on any terms, a foot of ground whereon to erect the most humble temple for the worship of their God according to the dictates of their consciences. If this is not persecution, we know not what is. They dare not torture their persons, but they do what they can to embitter their hearts ; they dare not injure their bodies, but they attempt to coerce their consciences. Is this consistent with justice and righteousness, not, to speak of Christian principle and humanity ? Is this the way to advance the interests of religion, to maintain the peace of the country, to bind the rich and poor together, or to raise the Government and the aristocracy of the land in the affections of the people ? On the contrary, is it not the way,—the very way,—the most effectual way of alienating man

from man, of breaking all the cords that bind society most closely together ? It is a mad attempt to gain their object,—the efforts of men who seem to be ignorant, of human nature. Nothing bespeaks greater absurdity than the supposition that a people, under the influence of conscientious conviction in matters of religion, can be concussed, and made to think as they think, and act according to their bidding. They might just as well think of stemming the tide, as effecting the object they would attain by the measures they adopt. It had been well had they listened to the counsel of Gamaliel,—“Refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought ; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest, haply, ye be found even to fight against God.”

We have also been deeply distressed to learn that there has been even the appearance of anything like insubordination and resistance to legal claims, and opposition to civil authority, on the part of any of the adherents to the Free Church. We are grieved that there should be the shadow of suspicion against an individual connected with us ; but we maintain that it cannot be laid to the charge of our church. It is in direct opposition to the principles we maintain, the doctrines which we preach, and the conduct we pursue. We justify it not ; it gives us heartfelt pain ; but it will surely open the eyes of those who talked of the people's indifference. Let this excess, however, be traced to its legitimate cause ; it is traceable to those, and to those alone (though it were tenfold greater than it really is), who have been oppressing a quiet and peaceable people, denied the privilege of worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences. Oppression maketh the wisest mad. Often has the charge of rebellion been brought against the ministers of our Church. A more foul calumny was never cast upon men ; for those that know their duty to God never can be undutiful to their earthly sovereign ; and let me say, that such as fear God are the nerves and sinews of society,—the best subjects and the best servants ; and I am bold to affirm, without any self-complacency, that such men as resist every encroachment on Christ's prerogative, will ever be found the warmest supporters of constitutional authority ; and the time may come when this may be found to be the case in the experience of the oppressors.

And now, reverend fathers and brethren, after having been brought together from all quarters of Scotland, and after having been engaged for days past painfully and prayerfully in building our ecclesiastical fabric, in advancing the interests of our third reformation, you are now to return to your respective homes to ply your sacred pastoral labours. I trust that you will return with your spirits refreshed, your love inflamed, your zeal quickened, and your hearts stimulated to do more, to preach more faithfully, and to pray more fervently to God for the souls of your people, and the interests of our Church, than you have ever done. You return, many of you, to the bosom of your families and your flocks, not as you were wont to do. You have been driven from that dwelling where your sweetest domestic comforts were tasted,—driven from that sanctuary where your sweetest communion with your God was maintained,—deprived, moreover (for a time at least), of those means by which you were enabled to render those dependent on you more comfortable, and sweeten the cup of the poor of your flock. But you return to those who are dearer to you than ever, and you return to flocks, that are more attached to you than ever. You return with the consciousness that you have been faithful to your Lord,—you return with the approval of your own consciences,—you return with a more peaceful mind far than those can possibly possess who are enjoying that of which you are denied.

What the Lord may have in store for us in after days, for weal or for woe, he only knows who sees the end from the beginning. For anything that we know, our difficulties and trials may only be in the commencement. We

know that after the last General Assembly in Glasgow, though the Church triumphed, they had to pass through a great fight of afflictions, and the fires of persecution began to be lighted up and to blaze with greater fury. Whether this may be the case with us we cannot tell. God alone knows. This we *can* say, that at this hour there is a struggle going on betwixt the Prince of Light and the Prince of Darkness. The enemy of God and the souls of men may be mustering and marshalling his hosts with greater intensity and with greater force than ever. We know, however, who shall ultimately prevail. The Captain of our salvation holds in perfect contempt the united powers and efforts of earth and hell against His cause and against his people, whom He identifies with himself. Brethren, look to Him, trust to Him, stay your souls on Him, take Him, take Him as your refuge and say, "account it all joy when ye fall into diverse trials, and rejoice that to you it is given, in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe in Him, ~~but~~ to suffer for his sake." Remember you are called to show how a Christian can endure as well as enjoy,—how Christian can fight as well as triumph. Oh, be ye ensamples to the believers in every thing,—disarm those who are without by your meekness of wisdom,—urge upon your people, as I am persuaded you feel inclined to do, the respect that is due to all righteous authority. Though they may be blind, be not ye disaffected; let us be obedient for conscience' sake.

A dark cloud may yet continue to hang over us, which has not yet been dissipated; but methinks I see the bow in the cloud, proclaiming all is well. Fear not. Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might; "your God shall supply all your need, according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus." Brethren, farewell. We have had sweet counsel together. Never, shall we all meet again, and see each other in the face here below. The grey hairs and tottering frame of some of us, tell that our glass is nearly run; and the youngest and most vigorous are just as insecure as the aged, the most enfeebled. We have all of us our race to run; and oh! if we meet before the throne at last, and unite with the redeemed there, it is immaterial at what period or hour we are summoned hence,—immaterial whether we meet again in wilderness here below or not., I pray that from the Church below we may be all called (not one amissing) to join the General Assembly and Church of the first-born. The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you, and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift on you the light of His countenance, and give you peace.

Brethren in the eldership, whose labours are labours of love, we thank you for your attendance; we trust you have not found it unimportant to be among us and take part in our deliberations and proceedings, and that your worldly interests may not suffer by your temporary withdrawal from your secular duties. You are a most important part of the constitution of our Church. Often have our hands been strengthened,—our labours lightened,—our hearts cheered by you; often have we been encouraged and stimulated by the deep interest you have taken in the affairs of our Church,—by the zeal, and fidelity, and skill with which you have discharged your duties. I need scarcely tell you that your ministers, and the Church to which you belong, never more required that your energies and efforts should be put forth and called into active and prayerful operation. For the Church's sake,—for Christ's sake,—go forth to your duties with redoubled activity; and may the Lord bless you and yours, and make you a blessing.

And, though not customary to go beyond the limits of the Assembly, yet I may be permitted to address a single sentence to the members of the Free Church who have honoured us with their presence. I craved your prayers at the outset, and we have had them. I crave them still, for we need them. Moreover, I crave your interest in behalf of that

Church that is now cast, in Providence, upon the liberality of her people. Manifest your interest by your lives,—show by your godly and consistent walk that you are Christ's freemen. Manifest it by your exertions, each one of you in your sphere, for the maintenance of our Church. Many of our godly ministers have made great sacrifices for Christ's sake, for conscience sake, and for your sake. Show that you are not indifferent to these sacrifices, and that you are willing and prepared to lighten their burdens by your exertions and by your sacrifices for their weal and comfort. And now, brethren in the Lord, I commend you all to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified!

And as we met in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the great and sole Head and King of the Church, so, in the same great and glorious name, we dissolve this Assembly, and appoint our next meeting to be holden at Edinburgh, on Thursday the 16th day of May next.

The Assembly then sung the last three verses of the 122d Psalm, and, after the benediction, separated at two o'clock on Wednesday morning.

## THE SECOND ASSEMBLY OF THE FREE CHURCH.

*(From the Scotsman.)*

The Assembly of the Free Church, after a session of one week, terminated its proceedings on Tuesday. Our first impression was that this second Assembly, within five months after the other, would not promote the cause. It might, we thought, open a door for divisions in a body as yet imperfectly organised, and by bringing out in strong light the deficiency of their funds, compared with the magnitude of their wants, damp the spirit of their adherents.

The result, however, has been different. There is, to be sure, a deficiency in the Sustentation Fund. In May, Dr. Chalmers anticipated that it would yield to the seceding clergymen one-half of their former stipends, which will be about £135. But the pay announced amounts only to £40 for the six months, or £80 per annum. He calculated that "their own funds"—meaning, we presume, the contributions of their flocks—would amount to as much as the sustentation allowance; but the deficiency here, we imagine, will be as great as in the other branch.

The falling off in the stipends is not wonderful, considering the vast burden imposed on the adherents of the Church by the Building Fund. The number of clergymen who left the Establishment was 470; but it was stated that applications had been received from 827 local societies, either actually forming congregations, or desirous to form them. Some will of course be too poor or scanty in number; but 600 churches are either actually building, or about to be commenced; and 103 more will be required by and by. The churches will contain on an average 600 sittings, and are estimated to cost £500, exclusive of the cost of the site. The expense of erecting 600 will of course be £350,000. The subscriptions towards this object amount to £76,000, transmitted to the Central Fund, in Edinburgh, with £90,000 in the hands of local treasurers, and to be locally applied, making together £166,000. The raising of such a sum could not fail to press heavily, and limit the contributions for stipends. But besides the £166,000 so raised, nine churches have been built by individuals and presented to the Free Church. Adding the value of these, and of donations of various kinds from Lord Breadalbane, the sum available for church building amounts to £180,000, or fully half the sum required. This is really a mighty effort.

Some of the meetings were private, and what passed at these is unknown; but so far as our observation goes, no symptom of disunion appeared in the public proceedings, except upon one point of small importance. It was, whether ministers and elders should be chosen by the male and female communicants. Some few of the Dissenting bodies—Dr. McCre's party, for instance—allow the male members only to vote, but among them generally the females vote as well as the males. The Free Church, like other collective bodies, has of course in its ranks some persons who are more troublesome than useful, and one of these—Mr. Carment—was much inclined to convert this secondary matter into a fundamental article of discipline. The Assembly left the point to the discretion of the Presbyteries.

We anticipated that the second assembly would be more likely to produce embarrassment than benefit to the Free Church, but the result has turned out otherwise. It has revived and reinvigorated the enthusiasm out of which the secession arose. There was no flagging, no despondency: all their proceedings, on the contrary, be-spoke a feeling of strength and confidence, and an assurance of success. Their speeches were listened to with intense interest by vast multitudes, who expressed warm sympathy with them; and the printed report will do a great deal to propagate the same feeling over the country. We know the tendency of religious enthusiasm to become epidemic. And when we keep in mind that the impulse under which the people are now acting, is the product of a thousand stirring appeals, scattered over nine or ten years of incessant agitation, we must not expect that it will either speedily subside of itself, or be easily arrested by external force. Of the two classes of persons involved in the movement, the clergy *cannot*, and the laity *will not* resile. We can well believe that many of the ministers regret the loss of their secure and comfortable livings; but having passed the Rubicon, there is no retreat for them. They cannot abdicate the position they have taken. The sacrifices they have made, and may yet make, will all be put to the account of the "corrupt Erastian" Establishment, and will only redouble their zeal in building up their purer church, and in sapping the foundations of the other. The whole body will soon come to think with Dr. Candlish and Mr. Campbell of Monzie, that the old concern is a nuisance, and ought to be abated. As for the laity, they will obey the law of the *vis inertiae*. It is not easy to move them; and not easy to stop them when once in motion. Narrow as the basis seems on which the secession took place, our belief is that the spirit which has created it will carry it forward. Those who joined it will adhere to it, and many others will follow their example.

The grand difficulty of the new Secession will be to provide churches. The sum actually necessary to erect 700 churches, including the cost of sites, will probably not fall short of £500,000. In a multitude of cases, till a place of worship is got a congregation cannot be formed; and till it is formed, contributions for sustentation, or any other purpose, cannot be well collected. Again, though £166,000 appears on the books as subscribed, we know, from experience, that money subscribed is not exactly equivalent to money collected. These, and other difficulties, may try the patience of the Seceders severely, but will, no doubt, ultimately yield to their energy and zeal. The churches once built, their course will be comparatively smooth. Their adherents are much more numerous than we supposed; for the 700 congregations ought, at least, to represent a population of 500,000 souls. The question, what can such a number of people of the middle and working classes afford to pay for religious instruction, admits of an answer. There are six millions of Catholics in Ireland, who support 2500 priests; and know from pretty good authority, that the average emoluments of the priest including what is paid to curates, are about £250; but adding the sala-

of the bishops, and the outlay for building and repair of chapels, the sum may be taken at £300. It follows, that the six millions of Catholics contribute £750,000 for religious purposes, which is at the rate of 2s. 6d. per annum for each man, woman, and child. If this is done by the poorest population in Europe, it should not be difficult for the men of the Free Church, embracing a large proportion of the middle classes, to raise twice as much. At 6s. a head, the half million of adherents would supply £125,000, and this would afford nearly £180 to each of the 700 ministers, apart from the allowance they may receive from the central fund.

## VIII.—LOCAL FREE CHURCH INTELLIGENCE.

### 1.—RECEPTION OF THE ADHERENCE OF THE CALCUTTA SCOTTISH MISSIONARIES.

The Calcutta Scottish Missionaries, in the month of August last, forwarded to the Edinburgh Committee, their joint letter of Adherence to the Free Church of Scotland:—it was communicated through Dr. Duff as senior brother in the mission—and the following is an extract from the official letter addressed to him in return, by the esteemed and venerable Dr. Gordon, and expressing the feelings with which that record of adherence had been received.

*“Edinburgh, 31st October, 1843.*

“I cannot in any adequate terms express the satisfaction, the delight, the feeling of gratitude to God, which your communication of the 7th August has diffused, not only through the Committee, but through the Church at large. No event has taken place, since the disruption itself, that has made so deep an impression on the public mind, as the announcement of the fact, that the whole Thirteen Brethren in India, have unanimously and unhesitatingly declared their adherence to the Free Protestant Church of Scotland. It has mightily strengthened the hands of the brethren, and greatly encouraged the hearts of the people. I believe it has also furnished a subject of solemn reflection to many who were not with us, and has decided others who were halting. We desire to thank God, and take courage, We see His doing in it—and can trace His gracious providence in the very circumstances which accompanied your communication. It was received a few days before the opening of the Assembly at Glasgow on the 17th. Your Resolutions were instantly given to the public through the newspapers. Your letter was reserved for the First Report of the Committee—and never did I witness such a reception as it met with from a meeting of nearly four thousand people.”



## 2.—CONTINUANCE OF THE CALCUTTA FREE CHURCH MISSION.

The Home Free Church Committee has appointed, that their several adhering missionaries shall continue to labour, in their present stations of acknowledged usefulness and influence. This is a step at once wise, reasonable and righteous—and one that meets with the cordial concurrence of the missionaries themselves, as well as with that of all their Indian Friends. In proof of this latter fact, it may be mentioned, that the missionary conference in Calcutta, embracing Missionaries of all denominations, addressed in August last a letter to the Scottish Missionaries, expressing their strong and ardent desire that they should not remove, or be removed, from the present scene of their operations—the London Society's Missionaries also, separately, and in the most brotherly manner, sent a similar communication—and the Venerable the Archdeacon of Calcutta sent a note, couched in the kindest terms, to the same effect, to the senior brother of the mission:—all these expressions of judgment and desire were forwarded to the Home Committee, according to their original design, where they had their due weight given them, as documents of the most disinterested character. The truth is, however, that there never was a doubt in the Home-Committee on the point of their missionaries remaining where they are. The question, as to the continued possession of the missionary premises now occupied, is distinct from that of missionary station. Negotiations on this subject have been opened at home—the Free Church Committee has offered to the Establishment Committee even to purchase the mission premises, and on any terms, although in all moral equity they have a large share of right in it. Hitherto the negotiation looks unfavourably; and we fear that there is but little probability of the mission being allowed to continue its operations on its present most desirable premises. A little time will shew; and the Lord will bring that to pass which He sees to be best for His glory, for the welfare of his Church, and the benefit of those Heathens for whom he has mercy in store.

## 3.—SOURCES OF SUPPORT TO THE MISSION.

The present resources of the Mission are of course limited, by their local character. The Missionaries have, since October last, drawn upon the NEW FUND, opened up by their Christian and very kind friends here for that purpose. No supplies have yet been received from home, nor could well as yet have been expected, under the circumstances of the case. There is no doubt however as to the result—supplies will soon be forwarded. Whether the incomes of the missionaries will undergo any change to the less, remains to be seen: but this we are sure of, that their friends at home have no desire that they should, neither do they yet say that they will. There is in this mani-

fested a peculiar generosity of spirit ; that the Fathers and Brethren at home, do not *wish* (if possible) to subject their sons and brothers abroad to the same hardships which they themselves are willing to endure—this is their wish and their desire. The Lord reward them for their kind remembrances !—The following additional extract from the Rev. Dr. Gordon's letter, on this subject, short as it is, will be read with interest even by those who are not personally connected with the prospects it presents :—

“It gives me great pleasure to state that the committee have no misgivings in regard to Funds. Among the many other tokens of the divine favour which have been vouchsafed to us, God has given our people a largeness of heart far beyond any thing that we before witnessed : and if there be any one thing by which our Church is more distinguished than another, it is in the increased ardour of the Missionary spirit. We have our first general collection (for the Mission) on sabbath next, the 5th November—and albeit I am not much given to the sanguine mood, as I dare say you are aware, I nevertheless look for something liberal.”

#### 4.—FORMATION OF THE CALCUTTA PRESBYTERY IN CONNECTION WITH THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

Although there have long been Scottish Presbyters in Calcutta, there has not yet been, in the true and full sense of the term, a PRESBYTERY. There has existed for some years a Presbyterial Body, an anomalous corporation, appointed by the General Assembly at home—possessing certain powers of a Presbytery, but destitute of others, and therefore denominated only a “*Presbyteriam body*.” Attempts had been made to have it constituted fully and regularly with full ecclesiastical powers ; but in vain :—“Moderate” influence at home, and local interests connected with the chaplaincy here, prevented the accomplishment of this desirable object :—and there seemed no hope under the old regime of ever obtaining such a boon. By the Secession of the Missionaries in August last, the Presbyterial Body became altogether extinct—and they were preparing to apply to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, to be re-constituted as a complete and distinct Presbytery, when (by last mail) the following document reached them and rendered any further movement unnecessary. In virtue of it, and in accordance with its provisions, the missionaries and such ruling-elders as may afterwards be ordained and elected for that purpose, are constituted into a Presbytery of the Free Church of Scotland in Calcutta. The manner in which this boon has been granted, has enhanced the kindness of the act : and it is felt to be no small honour to be corporately associated with those Fathers and Brethren at home so highly esteemed here, and to be permitted to present the first model of Presbytery in this part of the Redeemer's Kingdom. The Presbytery has held its first meeting for

constitution as will be seen elsewhere, and our hope is that it may yet promote the cause of pure New-Testament Presbyterianism in India.

Its record of constitution is as follows :—

*At Glasgow, the twenty-fourth day of October,  
eighteen hundred and forty-three years—Session 12th.*

Which day, the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland being met and constituted, *Inter alia*, took up the Overture by certain members of this House regarding the formation of Presbyteries by Missionaries in their respective fields of labour—the tenor whereof follows.

“It is respectfully overtured by the undersigned Members of the House, that the Assembly take immediate steps for authorising their missionaries to constitute Presbyteries for the due government and extension of the Church, in their respective fields of labour.

(Signed) ROBERT GORDON—ROBT. S. CANDLISH—  
PATRICK CLASON—CHAS. J. BROWN—  
ALEX. W. BROWN—F. MAULE—A. DUN-  
LOP—ALEX. BLACK—THOS. PITCAIRN—  
JOHN WILSON.

“On a motion made and unanimously agreed to, the General Assembly did, and hereby do, enact, that it shall be competent for the missionaries of this Church, both to Jews and Gentiles, in subordination to the General Assembly of this Church, and when three or more ordained missionaries are resident in any station or in any district, to form themselves into Presbyteries with power to exercise the usual functions of such courts. That, in particular, the Presbyterial bodies already formed at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, shall merge into such Presbyteries:—such missionaries as may be sent to India to officiate among our own countrymen there taking the place of the Chaplains of the East India Company; and one of the Elders adhering to this Church, for each of the ordained Missionaries or Ministers, being admissible instead of the Elders formerly chosen by the Kirk-Sessions connected with the congregations of the said Chaplains—that the Presbytery of Bombay, when duly constituted, be empowered to take Mr. James Aiken, Missionary at Poona, on trials for ordination, and to ordain him to the office of the Holy Ministry, if found qualified—and that all subsequent cases of application for ordination be reported by the Presbyteries to the committees on the Church in connection with which the missionaries may be labouring, for the purpose of obtaining the concurrence of these committees as to the farther steps to be taken. And the General Assembly further enact that each of the Presbyteries, so constituted, shall be represented in this General Assembly by one Minister and one Elder.

Extracted from the Records of the General  
Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland,  
by

THOS. PITCAIRN,  
*Cl. Eccl. Scot. Lib.*

## 5.—SYMPATHIES OF THE HOME CHURCH.

Under this interesting head we have had a good deal communicated to us, which it were unnecessary to make public. We select two extracts, because, they are from INDIAN friends—one from a former servant of the Indian Government, now retired; the other from a much respected gentleman in the mercantile department of this metropolis:—the concluding part of the latter of these two documents conveys an important lesson to the men of the world; and shews, how, if politicians “dig a pit, they themselves will fall into it”—and that, if statesmen “break through a hedge, a serpent will sting them,” where least they expect it.

(1.)—(*Extract letter from a Gentleman who formerly held a high official situation in the H. E. I. Company's service. Dated Edinburgh, 2nd November.*)

“This packet carries out the account of the proceedings of the Free Assembly in Glasgow, which I am sure will greatly refresh and encourage you and your brethren. It was a Glorious Assembly—very different from the former battling with the Moderates—and the Lord was surely with them. But it is very evident there is a bitter feeling abroad—quite a persecuting one—in regard to our Free Church's proceedings, and we know not what trials are awaiting us. Still, “if the Lord be for us, who can be against us?” I fear the Free Church at Calcutta may have its trials also—but there is a fine spirit abroad among the friends of the Free Church, and we are sanguine that, with the blessing of God, our foreign missions will be not less liberally supplied than before, notwithstanding the large demands on the Christian people, for the building of their Churches and support of the ministry at home. Indeed, it is the same set of people very nearly that have been the supporters of the missions all along. It is a great honour to the Free Church, and a strong incentive to still greater efforts in the Lord's cause, to have *all* the missionaries, without exception, adhering and making common cause with them. This I always calculated upon; though some, who had less knowledge of the men, doubted. We really have great cause to thank God and take courage.”

(2.)—(*Extract letter from a Gentleman who once was an influential member of the mercantile community of Calcutta, and who is now resident in the neighbourhood of London. Dated 26th October last.*)

“I have learnt by the *Hindustan Steamer*, that you and your brother Missionaries have left the Church of Scotland, and joined the Free Church. I was well convinced in my own mind that you would not remain connected with the Establishment. It is most fortunate that *all* have seceded; as it would not have had a favourable effect upon the minds of the young in the institution, had a party connected with that noble seminary remained in connection with the Moderates in this country, while the other party had given in their adhesion to

the Free Church. But, what will your young men say when they find continuing in that Church, which you and your brethren have left? I trust that all these events may be overruled for good. *Here*, there can be no doubt as to the success of the seceders; for, apart from other considerations, the sympathy of all thinking persons has been enlisted on their side, for the simple reason that it was impossible that individuals in the situation of the Ministers of the Church of Scotland, who had given up every worldly emolument, could be proceeding upon any grounds, but what they in their hearts deemed the best, for the spread of Christ's gospel, and the welfare of Christ's people. For my own part, my feelings are entirely with the Free Church; and were I to reside in Scotland, I should certainly never think of joining any other. Sir Robert Peel has lost many of his best supporters in this city, owing to his unfeeling conduct towards the Church of Scotland. Last week, when there was such a stir owing to the election of a member for the city—Pattison and Baring, opposing each other—the latter lost many voters, as he expressed himself satisfied with all Sir Robert Peel's measures. This so vexed many of the Scotch, who, though rank Tories, have felt aggrieved at the treatment of their National Church, that they withheld their votes, and Mr. Pattison was elected. I do not mean that this was the sole cause of his election, but it greatly helped to swell the number of his majority."

#### 6.—LOCAL FREE CHURCH.

**BUILDING.**—We record with pleasure before the close of the year that the Building Committee of the Free Church have at length obtained a site for the erection of the intended building in Calcutta. They were anxious to obtain a locality convenient for the interests of their constituents, and which at the same time might not unnecessarily interfere with other churches already planted. The site, we understand, will cost about Rs. 9,000.

**MARRIAGE.**—Two marriages have now been solemnized according to the Presbyterian forms, including proclamation of banns, at the Free Church Calcutta, by its Officiating Minister. In one of the cases in which a dowry was at stake, to be paid by a Public Body as Guardians, the opinion of counsel, and counsel of high and long standing at the Calcutta Bar, was taken. The opinion given, resting on the *Læ loci* generally, and on certain specialties of the case, was favourable to the marriage; and the Public Body referred to, have paid the young lady's dowry.

**PRESBYTERIES.**—The Presbytery of Calcutta, in connexion with the Free Church of Scotland, held its first meeting, under its new constitution, on the 25th instant. The clerk was instructed to communicate through the Rev. Dr. Gordon, as convener of the Committee on Foreign Missions, the thanks of the Presbytery for the boon thus kindly and

without solicitation conferred :—It was agreed to draw up and forward to Edinburgh for next meeting of Assembly, an address expressive of the Presbytery's spiritual sympathy and its desire of cordial co-operation with the Church at home in its important movements :—some local business was then transacted, and arrangements made in regard to future Presbyterian matters—when it closed.

**FREE CHURCH MINISTER.**—It is with pleasure we add, that the Committee on Foreign Missions at Home have given their express sanction to the temporary employment of the services of one of their missionaries, as Pastor of the Free Church congregation formed. This has strengthened the hands of those who had already been acting in the anticipation of such a decision : and there is cause for much thankfulness to God, that all things connected with the infant church here have gone on so harmoniously and effectively. To the Head of the Church be the praise rendered !

We are glad to have been able thus to present to our readers so pleasant a view of the affairs of the "Free Protestant Church." The darkest day of the people of God is brighter than the sunshine of the world ;—for, in the midst of the darkness of the one there is God ; in the midst of the brightness of the other there is a curse :—how much more then is the prosperity of the one happier than that of the other ! The present difficulties of the Free Church arise from its spiritual *prosperity* : so many more congregations adhere, than were originally expected, that the sufficient funds have become insufficient, and the very multitude of souls causes a dearth of money ! —The "Ross-shire Riots" have come to an end, after a season of intemperate folly on the one side, and of silly fright on the other. The Irish Soldiers who were led into the country, were astonished at the cause of their own movements :—"Such quiet and peaceful people we have never seen—why have we come here ?" As the frettings of a mighty stream over some jagged and ugly rocks, boiling into a little aggregate of froth, so came, so went, the Anti-Intrusion BUBBLES OF ROSS !—So we supposed it would be—so it is—so will it be there. Residuarityism like the Dead Sea, is reaching its level, of stagnation—it has the bitter, but not the salt—and how long spiritual life can remain in it, remains to be seen.

One exception to this general stagnation *here* is to be found in the "Scottish Correspondence" of a certain Calcutta Journal, whose general respectability we do not wish to tarnish, by naming it, in relation to our present charge. The correspondence referred to, whether the offspring of moderatism or malice, or of both, combined with something worse than either, is of an order which we have no wish to intermeddle with ;—for, by doing so we should but exalt it out of its present moral meanness. The Ross-shire man laughs at its account of the noble, but persecuted, highlanders ; and the Free Churchman

smiles at its silly calumnies against an honourable and self-denied band! Let the Journalist tell his correspondent, that if he will take the weapons of truth and candour into his hands, and can handle them, there is chivalry enough even in the despised Free Church of Calcutta, to break a lance with an honourable Edinburgh opponent, without fear of the issue. Let our Calcutta Cotemporary, whose great improvement in some respects we have lately hailed, be assured, that he has lost more than he has gained in the estimation of *many* readers by the admission of such correspondence into his columns:—and although the Free Church adherents gain, rather than lose, by such an exposure of spirit on the part of their opponents, yet they are sorry to be gainers by other men's sins, and would prefer a more honourable conflict than *merely resisting assassination*.

## IX.—A PARTING HINT OF DUTY, AND PORTION OF TRUTH.

### I.—A PARTING HINT.

A few friends in Calcutta, unconnected by denominational tie, but of one mind in the Lord, have lately formed a private concert for prayer. They have set apart a portion of Saturday morning, beginning at half past seven, for uniting in spirit, at their several residences, to implore the Lord's blessing. They selected the morning hour, as being generally the least embarrassed by ordinary occupation, and the least liable to be intruded upon by the claims of society:—and they selected the last day of the week, Saturday, as being nearest to the Lord's day, the grand day of gospel ministration. Their great object of desire is to obtain an ABUNDANT EFFUSION OF GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT—first, on their own souls—secondly, on all the ministers of Christ—thirdly, on all the churches in this land—fourthly, on all the unbelieving and heathen world around—and fifthly, to seek the hastening of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, every where and in every thing. The grand blessing fixed upon, to be sought with the concentrated energy, is the Effusion of God's Spirit—because the state of the church and the world is demonstrating that nothing short of a signal interposition of God, can carry his cause through. Human appliances are accomplishing but little out of the church, although surcharged with activity—all are beginning to wait for God; we would hasten His interposition by the multitude and concord of praying cries in every direction—for, we must end where we ought to have begun.

We trust that *some* of our readers, at least, will take up the proposal now presented to them, and join with the unknown handful who have already begun, on the next Saturday morning after reading this

note ; and that if they have Christian friends, they will stir them up to join in the same work. We may not know each other, but the Lord knoweth us all by name and place—and He who seeth in secret will reward us openly. • Should any of those friends who join, communicate by note privately, in order to shew that there are *some* who are engaged in this praying union, this concert of supplication, it may be well. Reader, remember that on Saturday morning, at half past seven, there are those who are *waiting to pray with you and for you?*

## 2.—A PARTING PORTION.

• DEAR READERS,—Read the following lesson, solemn, practical and scriptural, as written from the lips of JESUS CHRIST, your Saviour and ours, your Judge and ours. *Eighteen hundred and forty three* will probably have departed, before you read these lines, with all its burden, of accounts, for the inspection of the Lord of all :—and we ourselves may soon, very soon follow, with our whole accounts for life ! Where is *your* Talent ? buried in sin and the world—or at interest in the service of CHRIST our Lord ? You can soon determine that question, if you will :—ask it then we beseech you : Am I now where I ought to be ? Am I now doing what I ought to do ? Am I giving as I ought to give ? Am I bearing that cross which I ought to bear ? Do I *know* that I am doing my Lord's will ? Could I now *welcome* His coming ? Can I, in my present circumstances, say with peace or hope, “EVEN SO, COME LORD JESUS—COME QUICKLY !”

Hear our parting portion for 1843—and the first for 1844.

“The kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.

And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one ; to every man according to his several ability ; and straightway took his journey.

Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made them other five talents.

And likewise he that had received two, he also gained other two.

But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his Lord's money.

After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them.

And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents : behold, I have gained beside them five talents more.

His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant : thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things : enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents ; behold, I have gained two other talents beside them.



His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed:

And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine.

His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed:

Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.

Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents.

For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

THE GRACE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST BE WITH YOU ALL! AMEN.





